NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXVI.

MAY, 1892.

THE MAN, OR THE PLATFORM?

BY SENATOR M. S. QUAY, OF PENNSYLVANIA; SENATOR G. G. VEST, OF MISSOURI; REPRESENTATIVE C. A. BOUTELLE, OF MAINE; REPRESENTATIVE J. C. BURROWS, OF MICHIGAN; REPRESENTATIVE W. L. WILSON, OF WEST VIRGINIA; AND REPRESENTATIVE C. D. KILGORE, OF TEXAS.

SENATOR QUAY:

THE Man, or the Platform? Personality, or Principle—which is more potent in national politics? Should party fealty depend upon the character of the candidate rather than upon the issue he is put forward to represent?

These are the questions suggested by the topic you furnish. They are broad, historically considered, but as they concern the politics of the United States to-day they may be briefly and readily answered.

The conventions of the great political parties at Minneapolis and Chicago next month will present to the electors two candidates for the Presidency. They will also place before the people their statements of belief and opposing theories of legislation and administration. The candidate successful at the election will be charged with the duty of administering the office of Chief Executive so as to carry out, wherever practicable, the principles enunciated by his party simultaneously with his nomination.

Copyright, 1892, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, once in four years is presented to our people a choice not only between men, but between policies of government. The relative importance of either varies with the year, almost with the hour. It is affected by domestic industrial conditions, by commercial affairs and prospects, and by foreign relations. Practically then the relative value of the Man and the Platform fluctuates with the changing political conditions. The battle of 1884 was a contest of personality. Issues were obscured by flights of missiles aimed at the character of the candidates, and the result was believed by many to have been determined neither by the strength of the batteries of abuse nor the accuracy of the artillerists, but by skilful jugglery with the ballot-boxes of a limited and thickly populated portion of a single State.

The campaign of 1888 was preëminently one of issues rather than of candidates. Abuse was practically eliminated, and the preference of voters for either candidate was a far less important factor than was the sense of voters upon the question of protection to American industry. Upon this the Republican party won, though the Democratic candidate was weighted by the fact that his campaign was an effort to make him his own successor. Somewhat in line with the anti-third-term idea is a theory—plastic as yet, but tough and indurating to conviction—of the impolicy of attempting a Presidential reëlection. Owing to the enormity and the antagonisms of the corporate and material interests of the country, the clash of disappointments and resentments in personal ambitions, and the almost exact equipoise of parties, the retention of a President, no matter how wisely and impartially and skilfully (politically speaking) he may have discharged the duties of his high office, is difficult, and the Democratic candidate would certainly have been much stronger in 1888 had he not been elected in 1884. If there was any perversion of the ballot in 1884 there was none at the pivotal points in 1888. Personal factors in this campaign were the unassailable character of the Republican candidate and his marvellous faculty for discussing, day after day, great and varying public questions in speeches all differing in form and without an error of treatment or blunder of expression.

The campaign of 1892 will again be conducted upon principle rather than personality. This is demonstrated in advance of the conventions by the varying prospects of at least two of the aspirants for the Democratic nomination, which rise and fall as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the financial issue promises to become more or less prominent in the platform of that party. The Republican candidate will represent a definite industrial policy already framed in law, and a currency of stable value in domestic and foreign transactions.

The other question, that of party fealty, ought never to arise, because the party organizations ought to be so sensitive to public opinion, and so wisely led by those influential in council, as never to evolve a candidate unworthy of his cause. When the question is raised it is always unfortunate, not merely as affecting practical results, but as diverting the attention of the masses from policies to persons. Such a campaign is one of prejudice rather than education. However, as party organizations have wrought since Presidential nominations have been made by national conventions, there has been no occasion when voters ought not fairly to base their choice of parties upon platforms rather than upon candidates.

M. S. QUAY.

SENATOR VEST:

IT WOULD be an ideal republic in which parties, candidates, and voters were influenced entirely by a desire for the general good.

It is not pessimistic, however, to admit that the time will never come in a country controlled by popular suffrage when platforms will not be framed and candidates selected with the leading purpose of carrying elections. Nor will higher civilization, with increased wealth and luxury, bring a change for the better. More expensive methods in private life and growing governmental patronage will furnish greater temptations to sacrifice convictions and principles upon the altar of expediency.

The art of constructing a political platform so as to suit many interests and opinions, exposing as little surface as possible to the fire of an enemy, is with conventions an important feature of partisan management; but the public generally has come to regard these quadrennial manifestoes much as it does railway notices to the effect that "Passengers will not stand on the platform when the train is moving;" or, in other words, it believes that the party will pay little attention to its platform after the canvass.

This statement may seem harsh and exaggerated, but it must be confessed that the facility with which parties have constructed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and disregarded platforms in the past justifies the opinion that political exigencies will be equally potent in the future.

It does not follow, however, that in every instance where a party has disregarded its platform the motive has been vicious or corrupt, for in a new and rapidly developing country where conditions and issues are changing constantly, there can be no fixed and immutable policy declared by any organization that should certainly govern its action in every contingency. This is especially true in a large degree as to economic questions and the details of administration; for what might be demanded by the highest patriotism in certain environments would with changed conditions become "midsummer madness."

It is easy to understand, for instance, that in our early history patriotism may have advocated the encouragement by Congress of infant industries; but when these infants have become not only full grown, but exacting and oppressive veterans in their demands for governmental partnership, the system of encouragement once necessary must be regarded as unjust and wicked discrimination.

Modified and qualified as just stated, the fact yet remains that political platforms have steadily deteriorated in their influence upon voters until the platitudes of which they are usually composed must be looked upon as the traditional accompaniment of a convention, occupying in public estimation the same relation to a canvass as the brass bands and torchlight processions which are expected to attract the citizens' attention, although they may not affect his judgment.

Parties, however, and their machinery are absolutely necessary to popular government. They elicit free discussion and insure vigilant inquiry, with legitimate criticism as to public measures and men. To denounce party organization as an unmixed evil is like decrying fire and water because they often cause disaster.

Nor is it true that parties are divided only upon the question of controlling official patronage.

Between the Democratic party and its opponents have always existed, and will always exist, radical and fundamental differences in regard to the constitutional grants of power, especially those affecting taxation and revenue, which must always align the mass of intelligent voters on one side or the other. No platform is necessary to this result.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fundamental and irreconcilable disagreement between those who insist that the constitution embodies certain specific grants of power from the States to the federal government, the limitations of which, fairly construed, must apply to all public questions, and those who believe that the general-welfare clause of the constitution permits the federal authorities to do anything which they believe necessary, began with the convention which framed the federal constitution and will continue to the end.

It may be safely assumed from the nature of the controversy and the history of past political contests, that heredity of opinion, sectional feeling, or deliberate investigation and honest conviction, will cause a majority of voters to act constantly with one of the two great parties.

Between the opposing forces stands that large body of voters known as Independents and Mugwumps, who profess allegiance to neither party, and whose action must decide the evenly balanced contest.

With them, platforms and political history amount to little, or they would be found acting with those who are regular soldiers under a party flag.

It is useless to deny that party bonds are more easily broken than they were, and that the personality of candidates is becoming more potent. The number is fast increasing of voters who prefer in the candidate courage and honesty to high-sounding declamation in the platform. Of course when the platform announces principles and policies which commend themselves to the judgment and conscience, and the candidate's character gives assurance that he will adhere to these principles and policies, the path of duty is plain. When, however, the platform is acceptable, but the candidate lacks the essential attributes of honesty, courage, or ability, a very different question is presented to the voter.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the party which offers an unworthy candidate must pay the penalty by losing popular respect and confidence.

The strength of republican government is in the honest instincts of the people, and it is impossible to convince an honest voter that it is his duty to support a man for office whom he believes to be dishonest or incompetent. The trickster may for a time deceive his constituency, but the man who deals

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fairly, sincerely, and courageously with public questions will always in the end command popular respect and confidence. He may be often mistaken as to his duty, and be sometimes called upon to oppose heresies which have many adherents, but the people by intuition will at last reject the demagogue and cling to one whom they believe to be candid and courageous.

It is also worthy of remark that no platform can embrace all the questions which may arise in the rapid development of a great country but fairly beginning its career as a nation, and the people are justified in believing that the best guaranty of safety to the ship of state is having at the helm a brave and honest pilot.

The political history of our country shows that the idols of the people have not been our most accomplished statesmen, but men whose courage and patriotism were questioned only by party rage. Jackson and Lincoln had neither the majestic character of Washington, the varied knowledge and culture of Jefferson, nor the eloquence of Clay and Webster, but the people, with that unerring instinct which is better than the learning of all the schools, trusted them implicitly.

G. G. VEST.

THE HON. C. A. BOUTELLE:

AS THE object of elections under our form of government is to secure the most satisfactory representation of the wishes of the people in the administration of public affairs, it seems natural that more importance should be attached to the declarations of principle and policy in behalf of which appeals are made to popular support than to the individuality of candidates who are put forward as the exponents of the doctrines or ideas of the supporters, and who may often be comparatively little known by the great mass of voters.

The fundamental fact that our political system is based upon the competition of parties representing distinct theories or practices of government, and not upon the contests of factions devoted to the fortunes of individual chiefs or leaders, seems to render it inevitable that, under ordinary circumstances, the average voter should be governed more by the declarations of public policy to be inaugurated or maintained than by his impressions as to the personal characteristics of the candidates.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I think this tendency is clearly shown in the history of our most important Presidential elections. In 1860 the name of Abraham Lincoln had become hardly more familiar to the country at large than his homely features, the likenesses of which were so curiously scanned after his defeat of the famous William H. Seward in the Republican national convention. It was the clarion cry of "Free soil for free men!" that aroused the marching legions of that victorious campaign, and the enthusiasm of the liberty-loving people identified the standard-bearer with the inspiring challenge of the platform: "*We deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individual to give legal existence to slavery in any territory of the United States!*"

Who can doubt that four years later, when the great President had become better known, but when the spirit of faction was strongly aroused against him, the victory at the polls was far more largely influenced by the issue joined between the parties than by all that was said or thought of the personal qualities of the candidates. The loyal sentiment of the nation rallied to the support of the President, *because* his party declared against any basis of peace except unconditional surrender, and had called upon the Government "to prosecute the war with the utmost possible vigor to the complete suppression of the Rebellion." Not even the candidacy of the distinguished soldier who had but recently been the idolized chief of the Union armies, and who vainly sought to throw his military prestige into the scale as an assurance of patriotism, could save the Democratic party from the popular rebuke which overwhelmed the authors of a platform that pronounced the war a "failure," and demanded immediate overtures for peace, three weeks after Farragut had thundered through the gates of Mobile Bay, almost at the very hour when Tecumseh Sherman was marching into Atlanta to split the Confederacy wide open, and when Grant and Sheridan were tightening their death-grip on the throat of the Rebellion, in Virginia.

With principles so vital and momentous at stake, the most conspicuous personalities were dwarfed in comparison, and the people followed not a leader, but the gleaming banner of a beloved and imperilled country, to the defence of which they were summoned by the dauntless proclamation of the Republican party.

So, in 1868, while the renown of the foremost military hero

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the war was undoubtedly an important aid to the party that nominated General Grant, the Republican success was still more largely due to public approval of the demand for "equal suffrage for all loyal men in the South," and the pledge that "the national honor requires the payment of the public indebtedness in the uttermost good faith to all creditors." The denunciation "of all forms of repudiation as a national crime" struck the popular chord of integrity, and met with quick response from a people who had shed their blood as freely as they had contributed their money to uphold the national honor.

In 1872 the unexpected nomination of the famous Protectionist, Horace Greeley, by a convention of "revenue-reformers," followed by a reluctant indorsement by a Democratic national convention, involved such incongruity that the framing of a distinctive party platform was impossible, and a disastrous defeat resulted from the attempt to secure the election of one of the ablest, and in many respects one of the most excellent, men in public life, as the Presidential candidate of a party whose doctrines and policies he had for many years mercilessly ridiculed and denounced.

In 1876 and 1880, it will be remembered, after making all allowance for the popular interest in the candidates, that the serious contentions of the two campaigns were over the planks of the respective platforms. In the former year the Republicans insisted upon redemption of United States notes in coin and a tariff in the interest of American labor, while the Democrats denounced the protective tariff and demanded the repeal of the Resumption act. In 1880 the Republicans won again on a platform reaffirming the principle of protection and declaring the "complete protection of all citizens in all their privileges and immunities the first duty of the Nation." The Democrats declared for "a tariff for revenue only," and denounced as "the fraud of 1876–7" the very tribunal which they had so earnestly invoked.

In 1884 the nomination of Mr. Blaine brought into the foreground of a Presidential canvass the most brilliant and powerful individuality in American politics, and there can be no doubt of the remarkable enthusiasm created by his famous tour of the Northern States, in which his unequalled versatility and personal magnetism were so potently employed in behalf of his party. But Mr. Blaine's fame and his marvellous hold upon the Republicans

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the country were based upon the fact that he had become so widely recognized as the most fearless and trenchant champion of the cherished principles of Republicanism, and he was supported as the embodiment of the platform on which he stood. I have my own opinion as to the result of that Presidential canvass and the methods by which it was reached, but, without going into that collateral discussion, I think I may safely assume that no one will claim that popular interest in the personality of Mr. Cleveland was a principal factor in the Democratic success in 1884.

In 1888 Mr. Cleveland's renomination gave his party the benefit of such prestige as attached to the first Democratic administration since 1861, and the selection of General Harrison by the Republicans gave them a candidate from an illustrious family, who had rendered gallant service in the field and made an excellent reputation during his term in the United States Senate, but no campaign was ever fought more directly upon the principles of the party platforms than that in which the Democratic President was defeated in his own State and beaten by sixty-five majority of the electoral votes, in spite of the suppression of popular suffrage in the solid South. No stronger evidence of the popular interest in the party creeds could be found than is furnished by the discussions of the last Presidential campaign, in which the Mills Tariff Bill was made a leading issue by its indorsement in the Democratic, and denunciation in the Republican, platform. The same feature is conspicuously demonstrated by the fact that the publication of Mr. Blaine's famous interview, in which he criticised President Cleveland's message and expounded the Republican doctrine just prior to the 1888 campaign, exercised a greater influence upon the canvass than the personality of either of the distinguished Presidential candidates. I may add that the declaration of the Republican national platform in favor of temperance undoubtedly saved to that party many thousands of votes that it would otherwise have lost.

My conclusion is, that the declarations of the principles and policies of the parties will, in this year's campaign, as in the past, have greater influence with the voters than the individuality of candidates. Of course this view is predicated upon the condition that the candidates shall be fairly acceptable and representative men; for, while I believe the American people have more regard

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for principles than for individuals, I am equally sure that the nomination of an unmistakably bad man for the great office of President of the United States is a dangerous experiment for any party. The people may be deceived, but they will not knowingly elevate to the chair of Washington and Lincoln any man unworthy of the respect of his countrymen.

In this age of telegraphs and fast mails the people think, and know what they want, and will declare in their respective platforms the policies they desire to have carried out. The Republican party will confidently make its appeal for an honest ballot, an honest currency, and a tariff that will protect American labor and develop all the resources of our magnificent country. On that platform it will not fail to place a candidate worthy of the public confidence. On all these doctrines the Democrats must join issue unequivocally; or the evasion will condemn them. No party can dodge or straddle the leading issues this year, and while the silver question has found Mr. Cleveland tongue-tied in Rhode Island and Mr. Hill dumb in the Senate, the party platform must speak out as the Democratic House has spoken, and the candidate will be judged by the party and the platform.

Believing that the avowed principles of the Republican party furnish the soundest basis for the prosperity of the American people, and having faith in their intelligence and patriotism, I look forward with confidence to the rendering of their judgment between the two great parties, wherever that judgment can be freely and fairly expressed.

C. A. BOUTELLE.

THE HON. J. C. BURROWS:

IN A government like ours, resting on free and popular suffrage, it is not only the right, but the duty of the citizen to vote. His ballot is his voice, and the ballot-box the only medium through which he can make it effective on questions of public policy, and secure their crystallization into law. Even this, however, must be done by indirection. This is from necessity a representative government. At stated intervals public servants are chosen by the whole body of the people to speak and act for them in the conduct of governmental affairs. The candidates for these official positions both in the State and in the nation are usually selected

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through the instrumentality of party organization, and so become the representatives and exponents of party principles and purposes.

When party candidates have been selected and political creeds promulgated, the intelligent and honest voter will identify himself with that political organization which most nearly represents his views on questions of governmental policy. Of course the first duty of the voter, who has a just conception of the obligation he owes to society and the State, is to thoroughly and conscientiously examine every question upon which he is called to pass judgment, wholly free from all partisan bias, and reach a conclusion with sole regard to the public weal. Too many voters, especially young men, determine, or rather drift into, party allegiance first, and settle their political convictions afterwards. A necessary prerequisite to intelligent partisanship is intelligent investigation and well-grounded judgment touching matters of public concern.

Parties never make issues—issues form parties and so crystallize individual thought into political action.

The voter having previously determined and settled his creed of political faith, it becomes his duty to identify himself with that party which stands committed to the policy he approves. In no other way can he hope to give effect to his views on public questions.

This is a government by parties springing from the people, and the individual citizen must speak through party organization, or not at all. To this end the body of the people composing political organizations select delegates to a national convention, empowering them to promulgate the party's platform and nominate the party candidate to be supported thereon. This platform is supposed to embody the dominant views of the adherents of the party, and the opinions of the candidate selected are presumed to be in harmony with the party's declaration of principles. If the platform contains a clear and unequivocal declaration of party faith and purposes touching all matters of political controversy, and the candidate in his letter of acceptance, or otherwise, fully indorses the principles of the party as therein set forth, the voter, if his views are in harmony with the candidate and the platform, can give to such a party conscientious and vigorous support.

But it may sometimes happen that a large and respectable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minority of the party are not in accord with the party platform in some of its material declarations, and the party nominee is known to hold opinions contrary to those embodied in the party platform. In other words, the platform may represent the controlling thought and policy of the party, while the candidate is known to be in harmony with the views of the minority. In such case the voter may be at a loss to determine his political action.

Party managers, however, usually contrive, when great and serious differences divide the rank and file of the party, to construct a platform in such doubtful phrase as to make it susceptible of an interpretation to suit either faction of the party, and thus hold the party adherents in line. If, however, a serious difference exists between the adherents of a party and its candidate, both party and candidate will, in their desire for success, seek to cover up that difference by obscurity of language. The absence of clear statement, either by the party in its platform or the candidate in his letter of acceptance, is conclusive evidence of intentional deception. In such a case, neither the party nor the candidate can have the slightest claim upon the allegiance of the voter. Language of doubtful meaning in a party declaration or by a candidate upon a question sharply at issue is not to be tolerated by a self-respecting people. Obscurity of language on important questions of public policy is conclusive evidence of dishonest purpose, and is of itself sufficient reason for distrust of a party or its candidate or both. The clearest possible statement of party faith is due from a party and its candidate, and only such avowal can command the respect and support of the honest voter.

But let it be supposed that the party in its platform makes unequivocal declaration touching vital issues of national concern, and the nominee is known to hold views opposed to such declaration, the question arises, Which should exert a controlling influence over the voter in determining his political action—the platform, or the candidate? In the first place it is difficult to conceive of any party, actuated by an honest purpose, nominating a candidate known to be opposed to its declaration of principle in any material part as embodied in its platform; and it is equally incomprehensible that a candidate can be found so lost to all sense of personal honor as to accept a nomination on a platform with which he is not in full accord. But, if such a condition were possible, it would carry on its face such an expression of duplic-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ity as ought to drive the honest voter from all affiliation with that political organization. It would justly forfeit the confidence of the voter both in the party and its candidate. Somebody is to be deceived. If the principles of the party as announced in its platform are to be carried out in contradistinction to the views of the candidate, those who voted for the candidate rather than for the platform are to be betrayed; while, on the contrary, if the views of the candidate are to control, then the voter who sustains the party by reason of its platform is to be deceived. Thus, in either event, a portion of the voters will surely be betrayed. Under such circumstances, if there is a party having a platform and candidate in harmony, and they are both in accord with the views of the voter on the vital questions at issue, the intelligent and honest citizen will identify himself with such a political organization, whatever its name or his own previous political affiliation.

If, however, the voter lacks the moral courage to wholly sever his connection with such a party, then it becomes material to inquire which should determine his vote—the platform, or the candidate. Unquestionably the platform. Party principles as expressed in party platforms, and supplemented by party power, are stronger than the convictions and purposes of any one man, and in the end will surely prevail. The candidate, whatever his personal judgment, will not be able to withstand the solicitations of his party, upon whose support he must depend for future political preferment. He may be ever so determined, party and personal considerations will prompt him to find a way to his party's support and the abandonment of individual purposes. The platform of a party, representing the convictions and judgment of the majority of the party adherents, will certainly prevail over the convictions of the candidate who is under the strongest possible temptation to come to and agree with the controlling element of his party. Under these conditions, the voter should look alone to the platform in determining his political action.

J. C. BURROWS.

THE HON. WILLIAM L. WILSON:

IT TOOK fifty years of party contests in the United States to develop the existing machinery of national conventions for nomi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nating candidates for the Presidency, and for setting forth, by way of formal platform, the principles, professions, and promises of the party.

This does not imply that previous campaigns were lacking in definite issues or were devoid of partisan heat and bitterness. It is doubtful if we ever had more rancor in our politics than in the Jacksonian era, when, in addition to the burning issues that excited and divided the people, the strong personal antagonism of candidates aroused like feelings among their supporters.

Mr. Van Buren was the first Democratic candidate nominated by a national convention, but not until his second candidacy, in 1840, was a platform of party principles also made part of the work of the convention. As we read this first official statement of principles made by representatives of the party thus assembled, we find it a clear, honest, and reasonably explicit statement of fundamental Democratic faith, and of the attitude of the party to the great controversies of the day.

But the first Democratic candidate with a platform was ingloriously routed by a candidate who ran without the aid or incumbrance of any platform, and whose supporters, although kindled with an enthusiasm never equalled in any of our national campaigns, could not have united on any common ground, except that of hostility to the administrations of Jackson and of his successor and political heir, Van Buren.

It is clear then, from a review of our Presidential canvasses, both before and since 1840, that a party platform is not a necessary equipment for a political battle, and that great issues may be clearly understood and vigorously fought over without being put into any definite and official formula.

But as long as our system of national conventions continues, we shall have both a candidate and a platform from every great party, and it will not be easy to say whether the one or the other should be most regarded by the patriotic voter in determining his political action.

It may be laid down as a rule that no voter ought to support a party whose programme as to great questions he does not approve, or to vote for a Presidential candidate whose personal and political integrity he does not believe to be above reproach.

When, however, one reviews the platforms issued during the past twenty-five years by national conventions and finds them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so full of boastful rhetoric and insincere profession, so untrue and sweeping in condemnation of political opponents, and, in the light of experience, so little trustworthy as to promise and pledge, he is obliged to conclude that party platforms alone are unsafe guides for determining his political action at the polls.

The position of our great historical parties on almost all main issues is determined for them, not so much by their resolutions in national convention, as by their past history, their traditions and the general beliefs and feelings of their members, so that these quadrennial platforms are often of no special significance, except as they amuse us by their artful dodging on inconvenient temporary issues, and their efforts, by virtuous protestation, "to pander to the better element." Nevertheless, there are times when party platforms become matters of vital controversy, which bring on heavy battles within the party ranks, or even result, as with the Democratic party in 1860, in their temporary disruption. It is precisely at these times that both the platform and the candidate become exceedingly important. Whenever the people are in dead earnest as to important public questions they will not tolerate any juggling with them in platforms, and they choose leaders more for their merits than for reasons of expediency. In less earnest times, the "dark horse," or the unknown candidate, who has few party antagonisms and a brief or colorless public record, is often taken as a stronger runner before the people than a real party leader.

Yet the preference for such a candidate in itself shows the desire to escape the criticism upon the man which a better-known personality or more conspicuous public record might bring into the canvass. Conceding, however, on the basis of these general and obvious remarks, the importance of a party platform, and the duty of every party to deal in frank and sincere utterance, I believe that the man is, in the long run, more important than the platform: first, because the great parties, as a rule, occupy well known positions on public issues, and, secondly, because in the character and ability of the candidate, we find the best pledge of the party's sincerity and professions.

No rarer good fortune can befall a political party than to find or develop a truly great leader. By such a great leader I mean a man who, to the capacity of leadership, adds the sincerity and intelligence to lead in the path of patriotic and party duty. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not possible to exaggerate the worth of such a man to his party and to his country when important questions arise that cannot safely be committed to universal suffrage for immediate, off-hand decision. It is at just such dangerous crises that ordinary politicians and ordinary leaders refuse to tell the people disagreeable truths, are eager to flatter their ignorance, and are only anxious to find out where the people want to go, regardless of the ultimate effect on party or country.

The most thoughtful student of politics in our day has truly said, that the danger to democratic institutions comes when vital questions are submitted to popular decision that it requires tension of thought to understand and some self denial to submit to their correct decision.

Any long divergence between "democratic opinion and scientific truth as applied to human societies" involves serious disaster.

If, at such vital time, some leader who has a strong hold on the respect and confidence of his party uses that respect and confidence to save it from temporary delusion and serious error, he does it a service that a myriad of mere party managers could never accomplish. Moreover, a true leader has an influence on the *morale* of a party that can come from no other source. "How quickly," says Mr. Bagehot, in his "Physics and Politics," "a leading statesman can change the tone of a community. We are most of us earnest with Mr. Gladstone; we were most of us *not* so earnest in the time of Lord Palmerston. The change is what every one feels, though no one can define it. Each predominant mind calls out a corresponding sentiment in the country; most feel it a little. Those who feel it excessively, express it excessively; those who dissent are silent or unheard."

It becomes patriotism to strengthen the respect of the masses for such a leader, and to encourage their confidence in his faithfulness to their true interests, because it is chiefly when they are prone to go wrong, or are most exposed to error in their decisions, that this confidence comes to their rescue, and saves them from the penalties that invariably follow political as other misdoing.

If it be said that I am giving undemocratic prominence to mere leadership, I answer that even under universal suffrage we must take men as they are and with the training which they bring out of the past. The Democratic party to-day, and hence-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forward, has no more urgent political duty than the education of the people to the honest and capable performance of the work of self-government, and I am but repeating a truth as old as Christianity, and even older, when I say that, in the education of the masses, the life of the teacher is more catching than his tenets.

In the ages and countries of the past, military heroism was the prime virtue of citizenship, as the chief duty of the citizen was to defend the life and liberty of his country from foreign enemies. In our own land, and under free institutions, the prime virtue of citizenship is the civic heroism that, in the defence of true political principles, makes light of personal sacrifices, and does not hesitate to withstand the clamors of the people, the *ardor civium prava jubentium*, when it is necessary to save the life or liberty, good name or prosperity, of the country from the vital mistakes of its own people.

Let us do what we can to develop this type of heroism, and, wherever we find it in robust existence, to clothe it with such popular confidence and official trust that it need not waste itself in vain sacrifice, bnt inure to the safety and permanent good of the country.

WILLIAM L. WILSON.

THE HON. C. D. KILGORE:

A POLITICAL party, according to Edmund Burke, is "an association of men united for the purpose of promoting by their joint efforts the public welfare upon principles about which they agree." Political parties do not exist except among a free people, and they are essential to the preservation of free government and constitutional liberty.

The principles professed by a party, and upon which it seeks public favor, by modern usage find expression in party platforms. Such platforms declare boldly on such principles and policy as have the united and enlightened sanction of the party—cautiously on such as are not yet baptized fully into party fellowship.

In the year 1800 a congressional caucus gave to the world the first party platform known to American politics. It was an able and forceful presentation of the political creed of Mr. Jefferson, luminously defining the rights of the citizen, and accurately interpreting the delegated powers of the Federal Government and the reserved powers of the State Government. He was chosen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President of the United States as the great exponent of the principles of the party he had founded. From 1800 to 1844 contests for political supremacy were conducted without any formal promulgation in party platforms of the political principles upon which the battle was fought, though the canvass was in each case made, and candidates were elected, on issues clearly defined and well understood by the people. The successful candidates of that period were each an issue in himself more potent than all the platforms that could have been devised.

Party conventions do not create, but merely advance, policies and principles. These are greater than men and parties and platforms,—are immutable and ever-living. They are as well understood by the people before as after a convention has named its candidate and announced its platform. The candidate is in many instances predetermined by public expression, and the convention only ratifies the popular choice, and avows his opinions as to the polity of the government and the policy and principles upon which it should be administered. If either Mr. Sherman, or Mr. McKinley, or Mr. Cleveland, or Mr. Carlisle should be nominated, without any announced platform, and be elected President, there would be no doubt in the minds of the people as to the principles and policy which would prevail, and no man would have to inquire of his neighbor, or "read it out of a book," in order to be enlightened on the subject.

Public men and public measures are so closely identified that any representative man of high character, strong intellectuality, and pronounced convictions on great public questions, with the inspiration of a courageous statesmanship, stands before the country as the embodiment of the well-known fundamental principles of the party to which he belongs. Such a man, as a candidate, combines all the elements of strength, and he can command the zealous and enthusiastic support of his own party and of many conservative men of all parties—platform or no platform.

A political party may be united on well-understood vital principles, and may be, and frequently is, wide apart on important questions of policy. In such cases it is slow to pronounce on a specific policy which has not secured the sanction of the great body of the party, and the failure to declare satisfactorily on some such question will not repel voters who are mainly in accord with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the principles expressed in the platform and represented by an acceptable candidate. They are won by the great governing principles to which they yield assent, partially or entirely, and if a clean, brave, able, patriotic man and statesman leads the fight, the people will stand by him though the platform be not acceptable in all things.

The people are strongly wedded to a pure and aggressive policy vitalized by a lofty regard for principle and clean methods. They are, as a mass, loyal to that leadership which tends to elevate and purify the politics of the country. They believe that principle ought to be placed high above spoils; that a political party ought to be conducted so as to advance the principles which it professes and which give it life; that the government ought to be administered in the interest of the public welfare and in accord with the principles and policy about which they agree. They have an idea that a party has a higher and nobler mission than the mere achieving of success, that it may distribute public plunder to those who have public favor.

No platform, however binding, can impose any restraint on the cunning, corrupt politician or the meandering, unscrupulous spoilsman. He employs methods which have a tendency to debauch the people, and perpetually menace liberty and good government.

The history of Presidential contests demonstrates, with fairly conclusive force, that the personality of the candidate has more to do with success than any declaration of principles contained in the platform. The people will support with enthusiasm a candidate for President whose character and standing command their admiration, though the platform does not meet the sanction of their judgment.

Nominate a man well and widely known to be the exponent of the purer and better principles of free government, the embodiment of all the elements of a progressive, enlightened, and courageous statesmanship, able and upright, of clean, direct, and honorable methods, and whose greatness stands confessed in the confidence of the people, and a vast army of patriotic voters will flock to our ranks, and success will unfailingly reward our fidelity to principle.

C. D. KILGORE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POET OF DEMOCRACY.

BY JOHN BURROUGHS.

"To PUT the true praise" of an original and first-class man, especially if he be one's contemporary, "and set it on foot in the world," is not always an easy matter. Sir Wm. Petty, who used the words I have quoted in conversation with Pepys, said in the same connection that good writers were not admired in their own age because there were so few persons at any time that did mind the "abstruse and the curious." But there is one class of good writers who are always admired in their own day, and the true praise of whom is quickly set on foot. I mean those writers who use the language and speak the thought of their time.

But there is another class of writers who do not speak the language and the thought of their time, but of a time to come or a time just dawning, whose true praise is slow in getting under way. It is an old story and need not be dwelt upon in connection with our Poet of Democracy, Walt Whitman, whose just appreciation is so tardy in getting ahead among current readers. Probably, however, it is no more tardy than he himself anticipated, as he declared at the outset of his career that he was willing to wait to be understood for the growth of the taste of himself, and that the proof of the poet was to be sternly deferred till his country had absorbed him as affectionately as he had absorbed it. The absorption by a people like ours, so thoroughly under the illusion of the refined and the conventional, of a poet like Whitman must be a slow process, if it ever thoroughly takes place.

It has been the aim of Whitman not only to speak in the democratic spirit, but to exemplify it in his own person, and he has done so with a frankness that has shocked and repelled current readers. The penalty has been that his true praise has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

delayed, and false praise and false censure have vied with each other in misleading the public with regard to him.

The false praise has come from those who simply welcomed him as a great rebel against the current literary mode, or a bold defier of prevailing social conventions. Much as I cherish the memory of the eloquent and chivalrous Wm. D. O'Connor, and great as was his service in many ways to Whitman, I cannot but feel that when he praised him for his outspokenness on matters of sex, because the great masters of the past had been outspoken, his praise was false and misleading. Whitman's friends have no right to appeal in his behalf to a court whose jurisdiction he has denied. "Leaves of Grass" is not modelled upon the past; it makes a bid for the suffrage of the future, and if it speaks out freely upon matters of sex, the author must show a deeper reason than the precedents of other times.

His false censure has come mainly from those who had not the wit or the patience to understand him (which is true of the most of his adverse critics), and who, because he was not like other poets, denied that he was a poet at all.

His true praise must be sought in his faithfulness to his own standards, in the degree in which he has spoken in the spirit of democracy, of science, and the modern; not only spoken, but lifted and suffused these things with poetic emotion, his results bearing upon the problems of life in a helpful and stimulating way.

"Leaves of Grass" requires a large perspective; you must not get your face too near the book. You must bring to it a magnanimity of spirit, a charity and faith equal to its own. Looked at too closely it often seems incoherent and meaningless; draw off a little and let the figure come out. The book is from first to last a most determined attempt on the part of a large, reflective, magnetic, rather primitive, thoroughly imaginative personality to descend upon the materialism of the nineteenth century, and especially upon a new democratic nation, now in full career upon this continent, with such poetic fervor and enthusiasm as to lift and fill it with the deepest meanings of the spirit and disclose the order of universal nature. The poet has taken shelter behind no precedent, or criticism, or partiality whatever, but has squarely and lovingly faced the oceanic amplitude and movement of the life of his times and land, and fused them in his fervid humanity, and imbued them with deepest poetic meanings. One of the most striking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

features of the book is the adequacy and composure, even joyousness and elation, of the poet in the presence of the huge materialism and prosaic conditions of our democratic era. He spreads himself over it all, he accepts and absorbs it all, he rejects no part; and his quality, his individuality, shines through it all, as the sun through vapors. The least line, or fragment of a line, is redolent of Walt Whitman. Whether he makes poetry of it all may be questioned, but he never ceases to rule it and master it.

The thought that is ever fermenting in him, tingeing everything he ever wrote in prose or verse, revolving, taking new forms, ramifying through his whole moral and intellectual nature, and drawing all his energies in its train, was the thought of his country, its present needs, its future prospects. We find him thinking, desiring, loving nothing else, planning, planting, watering for nothing else, writing his poems with the sole purpose to fuse and compact his country. He has touched no theme, named no man not related in some way to America. The thought of it possessed him as thoroughly as the thought of Israel possessed the old Hebrew prophets. Indeed it is the same passion, and flames up with the same vitality and power; the same passion for race and nativity enlightened by science and suffused with the modern humanitarian spirit. Israel was exclusive and cruel. Democracy, as exemplified in Walt Whitman, is compassionate and all-inclusive:

"My spirit has passed in compassion and determination around the whole earth;
I have looked for equals and lovers and found them ready for me in all lands;
I think some divine rapport has equalized me with them.
You vapors, I think I have risen with you, moved away to distant continents, and fallen down then, for reasons.
I think I have blown with you, you winds;
You waters, I have finger'd every shore with you."

Whitman is of the people undoubtedly, but it is not the conscious America that he speaks for and expresses so much as it is the unconscious, the America of destiny and of history, the America that Europe fears and loves and is interested in, and comes here to see and looks in our literature to find, but fails to see or find, or at least only in hints and fragments. The conscious America, the America that has so far expressed itself in our poetry and art and criticism is quite a different thing. Certain traits and aspirations of our people are much clearer-voiced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the New England poets than in Whitman—in Lowell and Longfellow and Whittier, the aspiration for culture and refinement—for the well-bred, the well-dressed, the well-schooled, the well-churched. The college, the church, the club, the lyceum—the influences and currents they set going—a career of honor and distinction, or of usefulness and respectability—all these things are voiced in our standard poets. What Whitman has expressed, or aimed to express, is more latent and dynamical—more like the climate, the geology and geography, and the brawn and fecundity, of a new continental race. He would not be the schoolmaster of the people, he would be their prophet and savior.

What the modern spirit, the spirit of democracy, means when carried into the sphere of art and poetic utterance may be a question. Whitman has given us his view of its meaning—namely, to effuse the atmospheres of actual concrete life and nature, and not at all the housed and perfumed atmosphere of the accepted poets. This makes his undertaking new and distasteful to current readers.

The lesson of this poet is not merely one in philanthropy or benevolence, it is one in practical democracy, in the value and sacredness of the common, the near, the universal; it is that the quality of common humanity—workingmen, farmers, mechanics, soldiers, sailors, hunters, etc.—is the quality with which a literature for our age and country is to be saturated and filled. The spirit in which our poet writes is that spirit of universal humanity which it shares with all natural open-air objects and processes—the only spirit in which man's concrete life on this globe can be carried forward. We do not live and breathe and grow and multiply, we do not have health and sanity and wholeness and proportion, we do not subdue and improve and possess the earth, in the spirit of something exclusive, exceptional, far-away, aristocratic, but in the spirit of the common and universal. The only demand is that the common or universal shall be vitalized with poetic thought and enthusiasm, or imbued with the ideal of a rare and high excellence. Whitman's poetry is ever looking to superior persons or invoking them, is ever pointing to the grandeur and significance of the common and the near. He lifts things out of a corner, out of a class, and shows their universal relationships—shows that all things are beautiful to him who brings the spirit of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beauty, that all things are divine to him or her who brings the thought of the divine, that all things are great, every one without exception, if you take enough of the picture within vision.

The poems, I say, are bathed and flooded with the quality of the common people; not their crudeness and vulgarity, their half-culture, but with the commonness and nearness which they share with real things and with all open-air nature, with hunters, travellers, soldiers, workers in all fields, and with rocks, trees, and woods. It is only in the spirit of these things that a man himself can have health, sweetness and proportion; and only in their spirit that he can give an essentially sound judgment of a work of art, no matter what the subject of it may be. This is the meaning of Burke's remark that "The true standards of the arts are in every man's power, and an easy observance of the most common, sometimes the meanest, things in nature, will give the truest lights."

"What is commonest, cheapest, nearest, easiest, is Me,"

says our poet,

"Me going in for my chances, spending for most returns,
Adorning myself to bestow myself on the first that will take me,
Not asking the sky to come down to my good will,
Scattering it freely forever."

If Whitman's poetry is not also bathed and saturated with a lofty and determined spirituality, if it does not give out the qualities of the noblest thoughts, the most chivalrous behavior, the most stern self-denial, the most uncompromising rectitude, it falls far short of the standards which must be held up to us in this country.

Most of the hostile criticism of Whitman has been aimed at a man of straw. Heine made a vital distinction when he said: "The critic's great error lies in asking 'What ought the artist to do?' instead of asking 'What does the artist intend?'" Very few critics of Whitman have taken the trouble to ask what does the poet intend? what are his aims? what are his methods? They have chosen rather to say, he fails to do this or to do that, he fails to make artistic poems, he fails in the principles of good taste, he fails to observe all the proprieties, he fails to bring us only the pleasing and the beautiful.

Suppose he did not work with this end in view. Suppose that, instead of elaborating a theme, his aim was to exhibit a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man. Suppose that, instead of a book of highly-wrought poetic verse, polished and finished to the last degree—the interest always centering in the theme, never in the man—his purpose was to make a book full of vista and suggestion, full of escapes and outlets, with flowing but incomplete lines, starting thoughts but never elaborating them, begetting beauty, but never courting it, producing the impression of something fluid, protean, generating, like nature herself; with no more outside art than have the clouds in the sky, or the grass in the fields, or the leaves upon the trees, seeing to it only that life and power pulse through it all. We are not troubled about the arrangement of the clouds, or the grass, or the leaves. May not poetic thoughts, images, and concrete objects be so embosomed in a great personality, so charged and vitalized by spiritual emotion, and borne along by such a tide of living power, that we shall rather welcome the escape from conscious art than lament the want of it? It is so in nature; why may it not in a measure be so in poetry? It seems to me the only question is, "Are you man enough?" My own conviction is that Walt Whitman has shown himself man enough. The man-element in his work overtops all others, and gives unity and cohesion to all others. To exploit this man-element, to saturate the land with it, his poems are written. He may well say:

> "This is no book;
> Who touches this, touches a man."

We here come upon a marked feature of the poems considered as literary performances, upon which too much stress cannot be laid. It is never so much the theme treated, as it is the man exploited and illustrated. Walt Whitman does not write poems strictly speaking, does not take a bit of nature or life or character and chisel and carve it into a beautiful image or object, or polish and elaborate a thought, embodying it in pleasing tropes and pictures. His purpose is rather to show a towering, loving, composite personality moving amid all sorts of materials, taking them up but for a moment, disclosing new meanings and suggestions in them, passing on, bestowing himself upon whoever or whatever will accept him, tossing hints and clews right and left, provoking and stimulating the thought and imagination of his reader, but finishing nothing for him, leaving much to be desired, much to be completed by him in his turn.

Our interest and profit are always in the poet more than in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theme. See him moving through life, absorbing and transmuting its elements, drawing out their meaning and value and passing on, identifying himself with all forms and conditions of our national existence and situation, and putting on experience after experience like a garment. See him in the war poems, the tender nurse and father; see him in "Calamus" the loving comrade, the type of manly affection; in "Salute au Monde" behold him raising high the hand of fellowship towards the whole world; in the "Song of the Open Road" and in "Crossing Brooklyn Ferry" see his large and subtle philosophy and his robust faith and charity:

> "Now I reëxamine philosophies and religions,
> They may prove well in lecture rooms, yet not prove at all under the spacious clouds, and along the landscape and flowing currents."

* * * * * * * * * * * *

> "Only the kernel of every object nourishes;
> Where is he who tears off the husks for you and me,
> Where is he that undoes stratagems and envelops for you and me?"

In "Whispers of Heavenly Death" behold him pensive and yearning before the inscrutable mysteries; in "Sea Drift" see the poet in him trying to syllable the language of the unresting sea; in the poem of "Myself" see him revelling in the whole universe, giving free rein to every faculty and attribute he possesses, and abandoning himself to a play of power unrivalled in modern poetry. Always, as I have said, it is the man exploited rather than the theme treated—it is action, power, personality; it is me, it is you; it is our privileges and opportunities; it is faith, hope, charity; it is the body, the soul, immortality; it is our mastery over the facts of nature and destiny. He gives scenes, pictures, momentary glances as in nature, but no architectonics, no finished verbal structure—nothing apart from his personality.

We have the poet's own word that the main *motif* of his book is the treatment of man as he is in himself, in his own rights:—

> "Pressing the pulse of the life that has seldom exhibited itself (the great pride of man in himself)"—

in contradistinction to the bards of the past—who have treated man as the "creature of politics, aggregates, rulers, and priests."

The poets of English literature have no doubt treated human nature more or less relatively, or as showing itself in particular conditions facing this or that problem or circumstance, rather than unloosed and confronting them all.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our poet's aim is to outline a typical democratic man and to treat him absolutely as he is in himself, to speak out of the facts of the human body, the human passions, and the moral and spiritual nature *per se*, without any reference to precedents or conventions, or to schools or creeds; to unfold and exploit the natural abysmal man, stripped of all artificial trappings, freed from many of the distinctions imposed upon him in civilized society and exulting in that freedom.

If this looks like a return to the savage—to the barbarian—the reader has only to refer to the poems themselves to see that this is not what is meant. It is the highly developed man—the man atop of the science and the humanity of the nineteenth century—that is stripped and exploited, stripped of all ecclesiasticism, but imbued with a profound religious spirit; stripped of poetic traditions, but charged with poetic insight and emotion; stripped of political prejudices and preferences, but filled with the most determined patriotism; freed from artificial checks and restraints, but quickly responsive to all generous instincts and impulses; upholding temperance, chastity, spirituality; cherishing the old, the poor, the deformed, the despised; bringing the woman flush with the man; exulting in the purity and sacredness of every organ and attribute of the human body, and speaking out of that conviction with absolute freedom and directness.

It was no part of the poet's plan to exhibit man as a member of society, or the club, or the church, or the family, or the state, but absolutely as a member of the universal brotherhood of man, acted upon and swayed by forces that make for the longevity and perpetuity of the race. Had his purpose been to show him as subject to laws and conventions, to family ties and to worldly prudence, the outcome had been different. We should have had no "Children of Adam," no exposures of what social usage covers up, no exhibition of "that pride which refuses every lesson but its own."

Everywhere the poet identifies himself with this typical, composite, democratic man, measuring himself by the largest standards, matching his spirit against the cosmic forces, and appropriating to himself all the sins, sufferings, joys, heroism of mankind:

"I match my spirit against yours, your orbs, growths, mountains, brutes,
Copious as you are, I absorb you all in myself and become the master myself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This same composite, all-embracing character is seen in the poet whom he outlines and illustrates:

"Whichever the sex, whatever the season or place, he may go freshly, and gently, and safely, by day or by night,
He has the pass-key of hearts—to him the responses of the prying of hands on the knobs,
His welcome is universal—the flow of beauty is not more welcome or universal than he is."

"The mechanics take him for a mechanic,
And the soldiers suppose him to be a captain, and the sailors that he has followed the sea,
And the authors take him for an author, and the artists for an artist,
And the laborers perceive he could labor with them and love them,
No matter what the work is, that he is one to follow it, or has followed it,
No matter what the nation, that he might find his brothers and sisters there."

. . . . . .

"The gentleman of perfect blood acknowledges his perfect blood,
The insulter, the prostitute, the angry person, the beggar see themselves in the ways of him—he strangely transmutes them,
They are not vile any more—they hardly know themselves, they are so grown."

Whitman averages up the race, but the whole push and stress of his work is to raise the average.

"I announce a man or woman coming—perhaps you are the one.
I announce a great individual, fluid as nature, chaste, affectionate, compassionate, fully armed.
I announce a life that shall be copious, vehement, spiritual, bold.
And I announce an old age that shall lightly and joyfully meet its translation."

Since the above pages were written the subject of them has passed from this life. Serenely, expectantly, almost joyously, did he meet his translation. Blessed release from the bondage of disease and pain! As we performed the last solemn rites over his remains that March day in a Camden cemetery, the sun shone, the birds warbled, the waters glinted, and a great spirit of contentment and triumph seemed to brood over the earth,—all typical of the "large, sweet soul that has gone." Huge granite blocks, dear Master and friend, guard the portals of thy tomb, but the symbols of thee in our hearts will always be the sunshine, the tender and budding growths, and the flowing currents of the world.

JOHN BURROUGHS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FAMINE IN RUSSIA.

BY THE HON. CHARLES EMORY SMITH, UNITED STATES MINISTER AT ST. PETERSBURG.

THE present famine in Russia is one of those stupendous catastrophes which almost baffle comprehension. The general figures are sufficiently appalling; but it is only when we picture the individual distress in its grim details and then multiply it by millions that we gain an adequate conception of the real gravity of this calamity. It is my province to deal only with the facts as they are. That involves statements and not opinions. It concerns economics and not politics. There are phases of the subject which for obvious reasons cannot here be touched upon. Whether the visitation of Providence has or has not been aggravated by administrative faults, whether there are wrongs which ought to be righted, whether the Russian Government is or is not rich and strong enough to deal with the emergency, are not questions to be discussed here. When famine afflicted Ireland, the American people did not stop to ask whether the opulent and powerful British Government could take care of it. If there are things to be said on other points this is not the place to say them. If there are representations to be made in other directions they will not be weakened by showing just, generous, and sympathetic friendship. The present question is simply one of fact and humanity. But even the salient outlines have been given only in fragmentary, disconnected, and sometimes contradictory forms, and an authentic statement will not be without interest, and possibly not without value.

It is hard to realize that in the very heart of one of the great powers of Europe there are from fourteen to sixteen millions of people in absolute want of the necessaries of life, and dependent upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measures of relief for continued existence. Yet this is the simple truth. The area over which the famine prevails is ten times as large as the State of New York. It contains a population of more than thirty millions. To say that one half of this vast population are in utter, helpless destitution, without food and without means of getting it, and that they must have perished if continuous succor had not for months been provided from other sources, seems incredible, but it is a moderate estimate. Even this statement does not present the full magnitude of the scourge. Besides the millions who may be described as completely dependent, there are other millions who are reduced to abject penury, and who can sustain themselves to the next harvest only in the most precarious way. And when to this reign of gaunt hunger we add the ravages of disease, the epidemic of typhus, the suffering from the severities of an exceptionally rigorous winter, the decimation of stock and destruction of material, and the consequent difficulties of recuperation, we have a picture of widespread distress which can hardly be overdrawn.

The first inquiry which naturally suggests itself is, whence comes so dire a disaster? Is it possible that a single drought has produced a famine of this sweeping character? Is it possible that there was a general failure of the crops throughout such an immense area of the richest soil in Russia? Is it possible that such utter destitution, which reads more like ancient or remote oriental visitations, can come within the range of the modern European system? An examination of a few crucial facts serves to explain what is at first almost incomprehensible. The region covered by the famine embraces what was, indeed, only a short time ago the most fertile and productive part of Russia. But for several years past the crops have been steadily diminishing. In 1886 the distressed provinces produced 140,914,948 chetverts of grain, or 845,489,688 bushels. In 1887 the product was three million chetverts less; in 1888, thirteen millions less; in 1889, thirty-five millions less; until in 1891 it sank to 71,371,900 chetverts, or only about one-half that of 1886. A comparison with the total crops of the Empire shows the important relation which these provinces bear in the general production. Leaving the Caucasus and Poland out of the calculation, in 1886 the product of the distressed provinces was 54.87 per cent., or more than one-half the total product of the fifty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

governments of European Russia. In 1891 the ratio fell to 39.17 per cent.

The exports were not reduced in the same proportion. In 1888, the highest year, they amounted to 484,891,000 poods, or 17,456,076,000 English pounds. In 1890 they were 371,000,000 poods; and in 1891, the year of the famine, they still summed up 310,000,000 poods. The exports of 1891 were not, of course, from the crops of the year, but from the reserves of previous years, and they were made before the Imperial prohibition of exports came into effect. Considering the production, the consumption, and the exports together, we reach a significant result. The great staple of Russia is rye, and rye bread is the staff of life for the peasant. According to the best calculations that are available, the reserve of rye at the end of 1888 was about 338,000,000 poods. In 1889 the consumption and exports exceeded the production by 202,000,000 poods; in 1890 the excess was 41,000,000 poods; and in 1891 it was 283,250,000 poods. Thus, despite the draft upon the reserves during the preceding years, there was still a diminishing surplus until the fatal blight of 1891 came; but that brought a deficit of 188,000,000 poods, or 6,768,000,000 pounds. As the amount annually consumed per capita is reckoned at 14½ poods, or 522 pounds, this deficiency of rye—which, be it remembered, is almost the exclusive food of the peasant—is equal to the quantity of food needed for the sustenance of 12,965,517 persons for a year! There follows but one of two alternatives—either starvation or summoning other supplies. The total harvest of 1891 of all cereals and potatoes for the sixty governments of European Russia and Poland, deducting the exports of that year, was about 14 poods per head, or a deficit of about half a pood as compared with the requirement. With the quantity on hand at the beginning there was probably enough within the Empire, if rightly distributed, to sustain the population. But while there was a surplus in some parts, there was a large deficit in others, and with the limited means of communication it was impossible to establish an equilibrium.

The primary explanation of this complete or partial failure of the crops in twenty provinces was the terrible drought in 1891. Over a large part of the afflicted territory five months passed without a drop of rain. During a portion of this time a burning sun blistered the parched soil and withered every vestige of veg-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

etation. But there were other and concurrent causes. Through the spring the fierce winds from the East swept over the unsheltered steppes and blasted the early promise. The winter of 1890-1891 was one of little snow, and the unprotected frozen soil drank less than the usual moisture from that source. Ordinarily, with the melting snow and spring floods, the overflowing Volga spreads, like the Nile, over the plains along some parts of its border, and nurtures a coarse grass which serves as fodder. But even this failed last year. There was, indeed, an accumulation of all the plagues. Millions of súroks or Siberian marmots —a species of prairie-rat—made their appearance in some provinces and, having lost their usual granaries, committed great ravages. What the peasants call blight-clouds—myriads of insects darkening the skies—hovered over the land, and wherever they rested they left a desert. And, finally, in estimating the causes, something must be attributed to the primitive and unthrifty methods of cultivation. The famous black soil of Russia is rich and deep, and, ordinarily, when "tickled with a hoe, it laughs with a harvest." The rude wooden ploughs of most of the peasants penetrate but little below the surface, and with them the drought was fatal. But, within the domain of the same drought, on other farms where improved implements were used, where a greater depth was reached, where irrigation existed, and where the suroks were guarded against, there was a fair yield.

These diverse facts from different localities will explain the diverse reports. There were spots even in the famine provinces where the crops were good. There were districts which showed fair harvests, side by side with others where not a blade of grass or a sheaf of grain was reaped. How complete the failure was in many sections may be judged from one of many illustrations within my personal knowledge. Prince W. owns a large estate in Tamboff. He has a valuable stud of blooded animals, which naturally receives the best care. Yet so utter was the blight in all his region that he was reduced for fodder to the refuse of the sunflower plant. In such districts the besom of destruction swept everything before it. The garden of vegetables was left as desolate as the field of grain. Through wide districts no potatoes were grown, and this must be remembered in reckoning the short supply of food. In former days there were magazines within each district kept constantly full of reserves of grain to meet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emergencies. But with the extension of the means of communication, and with the decline of direct proprietary interest through the abolition of serfdom, these safeguards have been neglected. When the reserves were called upon they were found to be missing. The magazines had crumbled and disappeared, and practically the only stores were those in the hands of the speculators. The drought came and the famine followed, with no hope of succor except from beyond the hapless region thus smitten.

When we pass from the causes to the consequences we touch a depth which no plummet can fully sound. The distress within the fated section is something beyond description. Without attempting to picture the pathetic scenes which are reported by every observer, it may be possible to indicate something of the nature and degree of the suffering. To the Russian peasant the yearly crop is everything. He saves little or nothing, but one harvest carries him to the next. The crop means not merely food but clothing, fuel, fodder, taxes, farm necessities, and all the requirements of his simple life. When it fails everything fails with it. It is terrible enough to think of fourteen millions of people on the brink of starvation and saved only by outside relief. But this is only one element of the misery. To the pangs of hunger have been added the hardships of a bitter winter. The season has been the coldest for many years, and it has been difficult to procure material even for the scanty fire that serves to keep the peasant warm. The house of the Russian peasant is a rude structure, generally of a single room, of which the most conspicuous object is the great brick stove or oven in the centre. Little fire is sufficient to heat the pile of bricks, and the shivering inmates gather around it and lie on the loft above it. But this year there is a famine of fuel as well as of food. The steppes are barren of trees, broad regions are remote from forests, and the ordinary fuel is straw. The drought was equally fatal to this supply, and in many cases the peasants were compelled to huddle together, several families in a single cottage, and to tear up the thatched roofs of abandoned homes, to cut up the planks of empty barns, to seize even upon the wooden ploughs and everything that would burn, in order to keep from freezing.

Then there is besides a famine of clothing. The garments of the peasant are of home-spun flax with a sheepskin overcoat. But the crop of flax failed like every other, and through the long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

winter nights there has been none to spin. In many instances the sheepskin was sacrificed in the early autumn for bread; the frail, coarse-woven suits were thin and worn; and thus most of the family were compelled to remain within doors, while from the meagre and battered wardrobe of all a variegated costume was improvised, so that one of the number could sally forth for food. It was not an uncommon spectacle to see a wan, pale, hollow-cheeked girl presenting herself at the soup-kitchen in the ragged coat of her father, in the ancient boots of her mother, and with some sort of coarse sacking for her only dress. Anything more pitiable could hardly be imagined than these woful sufferers, without food, without fuel, without clothing, without work, almost without hope, but never without patience.

Yet, unhappily, there is more to be added. Where there was no bread it was necessary to find a substitute. The "hunger-food," used especially in some of the remote sections, is a compound which is altogether revolting. It is variously made up of wild arroch, straw, leaves, bark, ground acorns, a bit of potato, sometimes with a little rye flour and sometimes without it. The constituents differ in different places. Visitors to the famine region have brought specimens of this "hunger-bread" to St. Petersburg, and it has touched every heart that fellow-men could be reduced to such extreme necessity. The use of such a diet and the scantiness of all food could not fail to induce disease. In some of the famine provinces there has been no typhus, but in others it rages as an epidemic. In Tamboff there are only sporadic cases, while in parts of Samara and Kazan the inmates of every other house are prostrate. The Buguluk district, where the situation is at the worst, has 80,000 inhabitants and only one doctor. In several sections the death-rate has been fifty per cent. higher than the normal, and there are localities where the mortality has increased several fold.

Without considering the various provinces in detail, that of Samara may be taken as essentially typical of all. Samara is half the size of Prussia. One of its seven districts is alone as large as Holland. The total population of the province by the census of 1888 was 2,264,384. The official reports show that 1,368,000, or nearly two-thirds of all, are in absolute destitution and wholly dependent on relief. Of this number only 964,500 are in receipt of relief from the zemstvos or district councils. The remainder,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than 400,000, have no resource except private charity. Even for the sufferers on the lists of the zemstvos the aid is scanty and insufficient. The following table gives the number of persons in each district of Samara who receive relief, the quantity in poods of grain or flour allotted to them, and the period for which this allowance is made:

District.	*No. of Sufferers.*	*Period, Months.*	*Allowance.*
Samara	114,450	6	603,700
Stavropol	52,830	6	159,700
Buguluk	189,630	9	1,181,900
Buguruslan	73,600	7	346,600
Bugulma	79,850	6	302,200
Nicholaresk	250,000	10	1,852,000
Novozenisk	204,140	9	1,111,500
Total	964,500		5,557,600

Reduced to simple terms, this is equivalent to five and a half poods, or 198 pounds, per capita for an average of about eight months. But the quantity ordinarily consumed per capita for that period, including children, is 348 pounds. The regular ration for the soldier in the ranks is three pounds a day. The allowance, therefore, is but little more than half the requirement, and from even that restricted allowance nearly one-third of the necessitous are altogether excluded. In the presence of this overwhelming destitution the zemstvos have found themselves unable to provide for all, and any principle of distribution involving discrimination would have worked hardships. Under their rules peasants between the ages of eighteen and fifty-five capable of work, whether they have work or not, are excluded. Children under two years of age are likewise ruled out. These classes are saved only by sharing with those who are included. In the Nicholaeevsk district alone 114,000 workers were left without relief. The zemstvos seem to have proceeded on the theory that the peasants who owned one, two, or three horses were not destitute, because they could realize on this stock. A horse was reckoned at not less than 20 roubles, and two horses if sold at 40 roubles would furnish ample support for the winter. Unfortunately this calculation, which was made in the early autumn as the basis of the regulations, turned out to be entirely fallacious. Hunger pressed, fodder was as scarce as bread; money was still more rare; so that peasants were compelled to let their horses perish for lack of provender, or to sell them for two or three roubles, oftentimes for less, and still more often to slaughter them for the paltry value

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the hide. Under the overpowering distress and necessities all calculations completely broke down.

Indeed, nothing more signally illustrates the gravity of the calamity than the terrible decimation of farm animals, and this is one of the most serious factors of the problem for the future. In Samara out of 1,160,300 horses enumerated in the early autumn, more than 600,000 have been killed or have perished. Out of a total of 460,000 cattle only about 180,000 are left, and of the two and a quarter million sheep scarcely any remain. The details of a few villages, which have been specially gathered and furnished to the writer by an observer on the ground, will bring this awful havoc still closer home. In the village of Antonoffka only 40 horses remain out of 319; in Irschoffka, only 23 out of 227; in Soloffka, only 20 out of 240; in Gallgoffka, only 23 out of 400; in Patroffka, out of 500 families that had horses in the autumn only 200 have any left; and in Aleneffka 300 out of 700 farmsteads have no horses for the spring farming. In the province of Saratoff only one-third of the horses remain, and one-eighth of the cattle. In Tamboff more than half have been sacrificed. Official reports state that in Voronezh 100,000 horses out of 400,000 had perished up to the first of January. Thus the total destruction through all the famine provinces amounts to millions, and years will be required to recover from the blow. Measure this loss, consider the lean and haggard animals that remain, think of the peasants pinched and enfeebled by a long winter of hunger, remember that even the seed-grain has been consumed in many cases under the terrible stress of the hour, and we can form some idea of the difficulties under which the spring farming opens.

Many seeking to escape from these dread conditions have emigrated even as far as Tomsk in Siberia, perhaps never to return; many have wandered forth only to fall into a worse situation. Some have perished on the road, some have found their way back, and some have met a more cruel fate. Early in the autumn a number of German colonists left their homes in Samara in the hope of finding a better state of affairs, and moved eastward into Orenburg. But they were yet within the domain of the famine, and, to make matters still worse, the early winter overtook them before provision could be made for houses. In this exigency they were compelled to dig holes in the earth for dwelling places. Disease and death inevitably followed, and the informant of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

writer related how he saw in some of these caves seventeen or eighteen inmates with two or three dead among them. As soon as intelligence of this appalling situation reached St. Petersburg Sisters of Mercy were hastened to the scene, but the best they can do is simply to alleviate the distress. It is not to be understood that this is a picture of what exists everywhere, but it is one of the many incidents of an almost immeasurable calamity which is full of pathos and pity.

In the presence of this national disaster the Russian Government has not been passive. Without reviewing the administrative system, it must be said that it has sought to grapple in liberal measure with the tremendous problem. Before the first of March it had appropriated 150,000,000 roubles, or $75,000,000, for this purpose, and the direct outlay before June can hardly be less than 200,000,000 roubles. Besides this, taxes have been remitted, and work has been furnished where practicable. Vast quantities of grain have been bought and brought from the rich fields of the Caucasus, though, with the limited means of communication and the loss of horses, it has been difficult to convey it to the regions remote from the railroads. Large public works under the direction of the famous General Annenkoff of the Trans-Caspian railroad, and employing hundreds of thousands of men, have been undertaken. The forests of the imperial domain have been opened to the peasants for fuel. The direct appropriations by the Government to the zemstvos are nominally advances or loans, but it is hard to see how they are to be repaid. A large proportion of the peasantry are already in debt. Even in 1888 the peasants of Samara had to borrow 1,056,000 roubles, and the grasping Koolaks or usurers multiply the burden. With this load of indebtedness, and with the sweeping destruction of stock, it seems impossible to repay the present advances of the Government, and the enormous sum may doubtless be treated as a gift.

But, regarded for the present nominally as a relief loan, it is limited in its application to the members of the local communes. The allowance is thirty pounds of grain a month per capita. This, as already seen, is less than half the normal requirements of healthy men; but small as it is, when the peasant has paid the cost of milling and transport, his thirty pounds are reduced to twenty. But, on the other hand, small as it is in the individual item, it becomes colossal in the aggregate, and at the famine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prices involves colossal expenditure. So little suffices for the Russian peasant that a sum equivalent to seventy cents will sustain life for a month. But when it becomes a question of a million lives for which the government must care, as in Samara alone, and when this support must be continued for a period of ten months, the cost rises to seven millions of dollars. As has been shown in the case of Samara, the proportion of sufferers relieved by the zemstvos is two-thirds, leaving one-third wholly dependent upon private benevolence; and, taking all the famine provinces, even this one-third mounts up to the millions. This appeal to personal philanthropy has brought out noble examples of generosity and devotion. The proprietary class have, as a rule, in this emergency, proved worthy of their position and responsibilities. There are single families taking care of as many as twenty thousand people. The women especially have come forward with a consecration and self-sacrifice which commands admiration. If it were not invidious or indelicate, many cases might be cited of ladies of gentle birth who have left their homes, braved the dangers of disease, faced the hardships of an unaccustomed and trying life, and given up weeks and months to the work of feeding the hungry and ministering to the sick. With much that has been deplorable, there have been also in this work many exhibitions of true nobility. One other thing ought in fairness to be said. The Emperor has been published abroad as indifferent. It is only just to remark that this peculiar kind of indifference has been manifested not merely in a vigorous direction of the later governmental operations of relief, even to the summary dismissal of inefficient agents, but in gifts from his private purse, which, if the belief of St. Petersburg can be accepted, amount to fifteen or twenty times all the contributions of all the world outside of Russia.

A word respecting the large and generous contributions from America may be of interest. The dispatch of three ships, as thus far known—the "Indiana," the "Missouri," the "Conemaugh," and perhaps a fourth—laden with flour and other breadstuffs, has made a deep impression in Russia. Besides these ample cargoes very considerable sums of money have been forwarded. Independently of those which have been sent through private channels and of which there is no account, the amount received at the present writing is more than one hundred and twenty-five thou-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sand roubles. The spirit which prompts these liberal offerings is most warmly appreciated by the Russian Government and people. The knowledge of it has extended even to the remote interior, and the name of America is gratefully cherished. Such arrangements have been made at St. Petersburg for faithful and efficient distribution through responsible and trustworthy channels that assurance may confidently be given of the judicious and conscientious application of all the American donations to the object to which they are consecrated. It seems clear that, including the cargoes, these donations will aggregate a million roubles in value. That is equivalent to supporting more than 21,000,000 of people a day, or more than 700,000 a month, and the American contributors may accept that result as their practical work of humanity.

And, finally, what of the future? The famine is a severe temporary blow to Russia, but not irreparable. In actual losses, in increased prices, in direct and indirect consequences, it costs the Russian people more than a thousand million roubles. With their indebtedness and the devastation of their stock, the unfortunate sufferers in the afflicted provinces are plunged in a condition from which, at the best, it will take years to recover. But the Empire as a whole, with its boundless resources, has great recuperative force. The chief thought now is turned to the next harvest in the famine region. If it shall be fair, the skies will brighten; but if there shall be another failure, the clouds will settle down blacker than ever. The immediate problems, aside from sustaining life, are to provide seed for the spring sowing, and to make up the loss of farm animals. It is difficult to judge how far the first has been successful, and it is certain that the second is a work of time. Worn and emaciated with long struggle, and stripped of their material, the peasants face the requirements of a new harvest year under a load which would crush almost any other people. But their patience and endurance are without limit, and whatever their destiny, they accept it with a grim stoicism.

CHARLES EMORY SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RULE OF THE GOLD KINGS.

BY THE THE HON. WM. M. STEWART, CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING.

THE leading nations of the commercial world, France excepted, refuse to use silver coin as money of ultimate payment. Some of them, notably England, do so in pursuance of law; but the United States treats silver coin as credit money, depending for its value upon a promise of redemption in gold, in violation of law. The law makes no discrimination between the coins of gold and silver, but all administrations of the Treasury Department since 1873 have discriminated against silver coin and in favor of gold coin in the payment of national obligations.

No political party has openly defied public opinion by a declaration that silver ought to be treated as a commodity and gold coin alone used in the payment of national obligations. On the contrary, the Democratic party, previous to the election of Mr. Cleveland in 1884, uniformly declared in its national platforms that silver was honest money equally with gold. In 1880 the platform of the national Democratic party contained the following:

"We pledge ourselves anew to honest money, consisting of gold and silver, and paper, convertible into coin on demand."

In 1884 the national platform of the Democratic party contained more explicit language, as follows:

"We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss."

After Mr. Cleveland's election, and before he took the oath of office (on February 24, 1885) he attempted to induce the Democratic party to suspend the purchase and coinage of silver under

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Bland act, and alleged, as a reason, that gold coin was the standard, and that a silver dollar was worth less than 85 cents. He disregarded the fact that he was elected on a platform which declared that silver coin was honest money, and that silver as well as gold was the money of the constitution. He said:

"Silver and silver certificates have displaced and are now displacing gold, and the sum of gold in the Federal Treasury now available for the payment of the gold obligations of the United States and for the redemption of the United States notes called 'greenbacks,' if not already encroached upon, is perilously near such encroachment." (Letter to Hon. A. J. Warner and others, Members of the Forty-eighth Congress.)

Contempt for the Democratic platform and the laws of Congress could not have been more strongly expressed. There were no "gold obligations of the United States." All such obligations were then and are now payable in coin of either gold or silver, at the option of the Government. He could not have been ignorant of the great debate in Congress, in 1878, immediately preceding the passage of the Bland act, or of the resolution which followed as a result of that debate. That resolution, after reciting the various acts of Congress relating to the subject, declared:

"That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars, of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith, nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor." (*Cong. Record*, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, Volume 7, part 1, page 627.)

Mr. Cleveland was untiring in his efforts to stop the coinage of silver. In August, 1885, he instructed Mr. Walker, our Consul-General at Paris, to inform the Monetary Conference, then in session, that the United States was almost prepared to discontinue the coinage of silver. After the receipt of this information the Conference entered into an agreement to dissolve the Latin Union. In his messages to Congress in December, 1885, and 1886, he strenuously urged the repeal of the Bland act and the utter demonetization of silver.

During the Fiftieth Congress the Senate amended the Bond Purchasing Bill, as it was called, which came to it from the House,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by adding thereto a provision requiring the purchase of enough silver, in addition to the amount required to be purchased under the Bland act, to take the place of national bank notes retired. This bill was smothered in the Committee of the House through the influence of the Executive.

The Convention in 1888, which nominated Mr. Cleveland, was, through his influence, silent on the silver question. The Republican party was then out of power, and it became its turn to make promises, to regain control of the government. It declared that—

"The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic administration in its efforts to demonetize silver."

After the election the country was very soon made to understand that the gold association of London and New York was doing business at the old stand, corner of Fifteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C. But the friends of honest money, the gold and silver coin of the constitution, renewed their efforts to restore silver to the place it occupied as the money of the people previous to the mysterious and disastrous legislation of 1873.

The Administration marshalled its forces to defeat the coinage of silver on the terms and conditions applicable to the coinage of gold. It was a drawn battle between the representatives of the people and the representatives of Lombard and Wall Streets, headed by the Republican Administration, which acquired power under the promise to use silver as money and not as a commodity.

A compromise was finally effected. An act was passed in July, 1890, requiring the purchase of four and a half million ounces of silver bullion per month at the market price, and the issuance of legal-tender treasury notes thereon. This act would have been a step towards free coinage if it could have been administered according to its manifest purpose and intent. But it fell into unfriendly hands. The act declares that it is the established policy of the United States to maintain the parity of the two metals (gold and silver, not the two coins) according to the present legal ratio.

Such parity would make 412½ grains of standard silver worth one dollar, and $25\frac{8}{10}$ grains of standard gold also worth a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dollar. Silver would be worth, if such parity were maintained, $1.2929 per ounce. The President set the key-note for the depression of the price of silver by assuming that silver is not honest money. He declared in numerous speeches in his campaign "around the circle" that he would exert all the power of his administration to make each dollar equal to every other dollar. He did not say, in so many words, that the United States had issued and put in circulation about $500,000,000 of silver coin, or its paper representatives, which was not good money, and that there was a law on the statute-book providing for the issuance of about $50,000,000 annually of the same kind of depreciated money, but he indorsed the argument of his gold associates that the silver dollar is a seventy-cent dollar.

I am aware that it has been erroneously stated that the treasury notes issued under the act of 1890 are secured by bullion at its market price, dollar for dollar. This is not true. Treasury notes have no security except the promise of the Government to redeem them in gold or silver coin, at the option of the United States. The bullion purchased by the issuance of these notes is held in the Treasury for coinage, and when coined the United States will make the difference between the market price at which the bullion was bought and its coinage value. The holder of treasury notes cannot demand bullion in exchange for or in redemption of the note he holds. By the express language of the law it is the right and duty of the Government to pay these notes in silver coin, dollar for dollar. They are, in fact, representatives of so many silver dollars, unless the government finds it convenient or profitable to pay them in gold.

Is it possible that the President of the United States means to say that the Government has put in circulation between $400,000,000 and $500,000,000 of fraudulent seventy-cent dollars, and is continuing to issue such dollars at the rate of $50,000,000 a year? If not, what does he mean, and what has the Administration done to remedy this evil and sustain the parity between the two metals?

The law provides a method of advancing the price of silver by increasing the demand for its use. The silver purchased by the issuance of treasury notes is required to be coined and used for the redemption of such notes. Has the President made any attempt to extend the use of silver by coining and using it or having it ready for use as required by law? On the contrary, has he not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sanctioned the action of the Secretary of the Treasury in denying to silver the use provided for it by the act of 1890? The act provides that the treasury notes issued for the purchase of silver bullion shall be redeemed in either gold or silver coin, at the option of the United States, not at the option of the holders of such notes. The act declares that the Secretary of the Treasury "shall (not "may") coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the treasury notes herein provided for."

This the Secretary has refused to do, and he has also refused to require the redemption of such Treasury notes in silver coin under any circumstances. On the contrary, he declares that rather than pay out silver as required by law, he will sell bonds, buy gold, and increase the national debt for the purpose of redeeming treasury notes, and let the silver bullion purchased for that purpose lie idle in the vaults of the Treasury.

On the 17th of November, 1891, when the Secretary made his customary visit to New York to ascertain the wishes of the gold association or trust, he faithfully promised to violate the law. He said that—

"The resumption act confers authority upon the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds to any extent he may feel called upon to do to increase or maintain the gold reserve. The act of July 14, 1890, commands him to preserve the parity between gold and silver. It has always been the custom of this country to pay its obligations in gold. (Applause.) Therefore, should there be any trouble about this, and the present hundred millions of gold or reserve fund, as we call it, be intrenched upon, it was in his power under the law to issue bonds for gold paying 5 per cent., and replace or increase the reserve fund."

The resumption act confers no such authority. It simply authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds to obtain gold to redeem any legal-tender treasury notes which might be outstanding on the 1st day of January, 1879, but did not authorize the sale of bonds to buy gold for any other purpose. The act of 1890 provided for a different class of treasury notes, which were not outstanding on the 1st day of January, 1879, and also provided for the coinage of silver with which to redeem them. The promise which the Secretary of the Treasury made to his gold associates at Delmonico's on the 17th of November last was approved by the President in his message of December last, in the following words:

"Under existing legislation it is in the power of the Treasury Depart-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment to maintain that essential condition of national finance as well as of commercial prosperity—the parity in use of the coin dollars and their paper representatives. The assurance that these powers would be freely and unhesitatingly used has done much to produce and sustain the present favorable business conditions."

Was the refusal of the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, to obey the law and provide for the redemption of treasury notes by the coinage of silver treating silver coin as money? Was it not a manifest violation of law? Was it not a violation of the party pledge to use both gold and silver as money?

France, in 1875, ceased to coin silver, but she did not attempt to disparage the silver which had already been coined. On the contrary she has always kept her reserves of gold and silver about equal and paid her public creditors in either gold or silver, whichever was most beneficial or convenient for the government. The contrast between the administration of France in obeying the law, and the action of the Treasury Department in disregarding the statutes of the United States by discriminating against silver, is most remarkable.

The United States contracted an enormous war debt, payable in greenbacks. In March, 1869, an act was passed declaring that the public debt was payable in gold or silver coin. The act of July 14, 1870, authorizing the refunding of the national debt under which all outstanding United States bonds were issued, provides for their redemption in coin of the standard value of that date, to wit, a dollar composed of $25\frac{8}{10}$-grains of standard gold or 412½ grains of standard silver.

From 1873 until the present time every obligation of the United States has been payable in silver. No Secretary of the Treasury has exercised the option to pay in silver, but in violation of law every Secretary has given the bondholder the option to require payment in gold, and finally the present Secretary, with the indorsement of the President, has made a solemn promise, without the authority of law, to issue bonds to redeem treasury notes which, by the act of 1890, are redeemable in silver. The repudiation of silver by the Administration, and the assumption that it is not good money for the payment of debts, are, in effect, a declaration that silver coin and its representatives in treasury notes and silver certificates are not good money. It is a declaration that one-half of the money of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States in actual circulation, exclusive of the reserves in the Treasury and in national banks, is not good money, but is a depreciated and fraudulent currency palmed off by the Government of the United States upon the people.

Whither does the assertion that the silver dollar and its paper representatives are only seventy-cent dollars lead? More than one-half, as before stated, of the money in actual circulation in the United States is of this character; and under the act of 1890 $50,000,000 more of the same kind of money is annually added to the circulation of the country. What is to be done with it? Shall it be repudiated and retired, and the actual circulation be contracted one-half, or shall it be made good by appropriate legislation?

The United States cannot afford further to depreciate and degrade silver and deny to it its money function. The legislation has gone too far. Silver bullion must be maintained at a parity with gold bullion at the ratio established by law. Free coinage will do this, and nothing short of free coinage will accomplish the purpose; for whenever the Government at the mint discriminates against either of the metals, the people will do the same. If silver is not to be restored to the place it occupied previous to 1873, why did the Democratic party, while it was out of power, declare that silver was honest money equally with gold? Why did the Republican party, when it sought to regain power, declare that it was in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and why did it condemn the administration of President Cleveland for its efforts in demonetizing silver?

The value of all articles desired by man, when the quantity is limited, is determined by the law of supply and demand. Until the unfortunate legislation of 1873 there was an unlimited demand at the mint for both gold and silver at the ratio established by law. That unlimited demand, so far as gold is concerned, still remains, but the demand for silver for coinage has been destroyed by law. The market value of both gold and silver always has been and always will be the mint price, because no man would sell either gold or silver for a less price than he can obtain at the mint. Free coinage maintained the parity of the two metals from the foundation of the Government until the right of coinage was denied to silver. Who can say that free coinage would not now have a like effect in restoring and maintaining such parity? Free

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coinage would make the demand for silver equal to the demand for gold, and the mint price would determine the market price as it did from the foundation of the Government until the conspiracy was formed to reject silver.

What must be the inevitable result upon the civilized world of the single gold standard? Eighteen years ago there were about $7,500,000,000 of gold and silver coin in the world, which, in the language of the Royal Commission of England, was one money. To-day all the gold coin in the world does not exceed $3,700,000,000. If the basis of circulation and credit is confined to gold alone, the danger line is already passed. Never in the history of the world did there exist as large a volume of credit as we now have, resting upon so narrow a basis.

Since silver was demonetized there have been purchased, and are now held as government and bank reserves, not less than a thousand millions of gold coin, besides many thousands of millions that have been daily purchased to liquidate obligations contracted to be paid in silver or paper. The United States has purchased several thousand millions to pay interest and maturing obligations, and now holds for reserves (for little or none of it is in circulation) nearly $600,000,000 of gold. Germany has followed the example of the United States in the purchase of gold. Egypt and Italy have been compelled to do the same. These purchases were compelled by law, because the right to use silver was denied by legislation.

The gold contractionists are not satisfied. They are attempting to compel Austria (and she has begun the deadly work) to buy some $200,000,000 of gold to hold in her treasury as a basis for gold resumption. This will require about 5 per cent. of all the gold in the world. They further threaten that England will require India to replace her $900,000,000 of silver with gold, which would require 25 per cent. of the gold in the world. The gold advocates even contend that France must ultimately join the gold trust and dispose of her $650,000,000 of silver and replace the same with gold.

It must be borne in mind that the nation or the people who succeed in this fierce competition in accumulating gold must pay the highest price, which means that they must sell their labor and their products cheapest. The competition in purchasing gold to discharge obligations payable in silver has already reduced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the price of farm products in this country fully 50 per cent., and if the process which the gold men advocate is continued until the gold standard is reached throughout the world, prices must fall more than 50 per cent. below their present level. The obligations to pay money already existing will require sacrifices such as no generation of men have ever made.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his celebrated speech of November 17, 1891, admitted that there was not gold enough for use as money. He said :

> "It is now agreed on all sides that gold alone furnishes too narrow a basis upon which to conduct the money affairs of the world."

A more patent truth was never uttered. In the face of this admitted fact he proposed to treat the $500,000,000 of silver coin, silver certificates and treasury notes as merely credit money depending upon the narrow basis—gold—and pledged himself to the gold syndicate that he would not sell bonds and buy gold to redeem treasury notes as provided by the act of 1890, for the purpose of avoiding the use of silver as money.

What more daring and audacious proposition could be suggested for the purpose of enhancing the price of gold and depressing the price of property than to sell bonds and buy gold to redeem all the treasury notes which may be issued under the act of 1890 ? The execution of such a project, if successful, would destroy the reserves of gold of every country in Europe, enormously advance the price of gold, and increase the disparity between gold and silver bullion. Is not this a strange way of executing a statute, the declared intention of which is to maintain the parity between the two metals ?

The advocates of gold express great anxiety to make each dollar as good as every other dollar. This may be done, it is true, by a promise to redeem one dollar in another dollar. The Government may promise to redeem its paper money and its silver money in gold coin. While such a promise can be maintained, the paper money and the silver money are as good as the gold money, but the silver money in such a case is merely credit money, depending upon the promise to redeem in gold for its value, and is no better than paper money.

The only possible way to make a silver dollar as good as a gold dollar, in the full sense of the expression, is to restore silver

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the place it occupied previous to 1873. Give it the money function; treat it as the money of the constitution; open the mints to its free coinage; make an unlimited demand for it at a fixed price, and the price so fixed at the mint will be the market price of the bullion; for no one will sell 412½ grains of silver for less than a dollar if he can have it exchanged at the mint for a dollar. This method has been tried and never failed. It is the mode prescribed by the constitution, indorsed by the Democratic party in 1880 and 1884, and by the Republican party in 1888, but now repudiated by a Republican administration.

The fact that the Executive Department has prevented the use of silver as money for eighteen years, by obstructing the passage of a free-coinage law and by refusing to recognize silver coin as money for the purpose of paying national obligations, is a warning which the people cannot afford to disregard. Is it probable that the gold trust will select different candidates in the future from those whom it has selected in the past? Is it probable, so long as the gold trust is allowed to designate candidates for the Presidency, that the people will obtain relief from the calamity of contraction, falling prices, stagnation in business, and hard times?

Free coinage of silver is no experiment. It was practised from the foundation of the Government until 1873. At that time there was not too much coin of gold and silver for use as money. There has not been too much of both gold and silver produced since that time to supply the growing demands of business. The entire production of both metals has not been enough to keep pace with the growth of population. There has not been half enough gold produced for that purpose. There is no probability of an increased supply of gold. On the contrary, the demand for gold for ornaments and use in the arts is increasing. The amount of gold coin must decrease rather than increase. All the gold in the world is either owned or controlled by a very few men. The question for the people to decide is, Shall the rule of the gold kings be perpetual?

WM. M. STEWART.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BEHRING SEA CONTROVERSY.

BY GEN. B. F. BUTLER AND THE MARQUIS OF LORNE.

GEN. B. F. BUTLER:

IT IS not a misfortune that, in examining this subject of difference between Great Britain and the United States, we are relieved from going into the musty learning which might be necessary to determine our national rights and our title to property that we claim. For all present use those questions are passed by.

All claims to the lands and waters on this continent have been obtained through the right of discovery and occupation. Through these, more than a hundred years ago, Russia came into possession of the Aleutian Islands and the territory now called Alaska, and exercised exclusive jurisdiction, unquestioned, against all the world, until she transferred her said possessions and appertaining rights thereto, to the United States. Since then and until within the last five years this government has exercised over said possessions jurisdiction substantially the same as that which had been previously exercised and claimed by Russia.

Now, one nation only, Great Britain, sets up an adverse claim, insisting that her subjects under her flag may appropriate, at all seasons of the year, the fur-bearing seals and sea otters, which have their homes on the islands and shores, wherever they may be found while swimming in the sea—not forbearing also to slaughter them on shore. To such action of the Canadian English subjects our government protested and took measures to protect these animals from being thus hunted to their possible extinc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and to our injury. Whereupon her government suggested to our government that these opposing claims of the two nations be submitted to arbitrament to determine the rights of each, by which both nations should abide; proposing that until those rights were so established both nations should cease hunting the seals, and should send ships to guard the waters in dispute from all vessels violating the claimed rights of either party. They, consequently, entered into an agreement known in diplomacy as a "*modus vivendi*," i. e., a manner of conduct of subjects of both nations in that regard while the contentions were being decided, so that the seals might not be destroyed; and that *modus* has existed for one sealing season. It now appears beyond dispute that under that *modus*, while United States vessels and English vessels were guarding the waters, many thousand seals were destroyed, more than were ever taken in a single season before; so that so far as the seals were concerned the *modus* was a misnomer, being in fact a *modus exterminandi*. Our vessels seized four of the poaching schooners, two under the American flag and two under the British flag, and took them to San Francisco, and had them condemned by the courts. The enormous navy of England, which is her pride and her boast, during that year seized two British poaching vessels and took them into her ports, but history does not record any other trouble that happened to them.

The submission by treaty of the rights of the parties to arbitration is a mutual acknowledgment as regards each other to the full extent of the rights claimed by each while the arbitration is pending. And both are bound not to do anything to disturb the claimed rights of either until a decision is reached.

After delays in relation to the details of the arbitration, of which neither party complains, the treaty establishing it was concluded in due form by England, was signed by President Harrison and was by him submitted to the Senate.

Supposing that nothing stood in the way of the ratification of the treaty, the President addressed a note to Lord Salisbury, asking that the *modus vivendi* should be continued during the pendency of the arbitration, and stating the necessity of both nations very early taking the seals in charge, because some forty-seven vessels had sailed from Canadian ports for the purpose of catching the seals at an earlier day and in a larger number than ever before; so that, in his belief, there was danger of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the destruction of the seals, as the larger portion of the catch was of the female seal in the water on its way to our islands and shores to its breeding haunts.

To that note the British premier made answer, that he did not propose to renew the *modus vivendi* during the time of the arbitration, because that time was likely to cover the sealing season of 1893, and as the Canadian poachers had expended a great deal of capital in fitting out their vessels, if they failed to catch seals enough to make the enterprise profitable, they would be damaged. His Lordship was apparently unmindful of the fact that, if the arbitration went on long enough, all the seals might be destroyed, and that when the arbitrators found in favor of the United States there would be no property on which the award could operate, and so the trouble and expense of the arbitration would be thrown away.

Let us illustrate his Lordship's proposition. It may, perhaps, be well done in this way: A had a fine and profitable piece of timber land, inherited from his ancestors, to which nobody had made any claim within the memory of man. Suddenly his neighbor B claims the right to cut the wood and timber off that land, and makes that claim in the form of chopping it down and taking it away. A tries to stop him in this unneighborly work of devastation. B, asserting his rights, says, "I will submit our respective rights to this property to arbitration," B being a litigious fellow. A, not wanting a lawsuit, says, "Agreed; let us arbitrate, but in the meantime let us so arrange it that nobody shall cut any of the trees during the arbitration." While the formalities of making out the form of arbitrament are going on, both mutually agree to help watch the woodchoppers so that the trees may be spared. The arbitration being concluded upon, A says to B: "Let us continue to watch the woodchoppers until the award is made." "Oh, no!" says B, "my woodchoppers have put themselves to great expense in providing the tools with which to cut down the timber, and teams to haul it away, and they will lose their investment of capital if they do not go on cutting and taking the timber. Therefore, I am going to aid them all I can in their operations."

What would be said of such a transaction in ordinary life and such conduct between man and man?

But Lord Salisbury's proposition does not stop there even.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He says: "Let my choppers go on and cut all the wood they can; you find out the names of those who do it, if you can, and take the bond of each of them, so that they may pay the damage." Now, then, if such action was taken by B against A, and he should go to his friends and say, "What ought to be done to a man who has treated me like that?" would not the reply of his friends be, "If he does not apologize for his insulting proposition, and behave himself, whip him like a dog, if you can; whether you can or not, it is due to your manhood and self-respect to try?" Would not the just judgment of all men sanction such a course?

Leaving our illustration and returning to the case under consideration:

What President Harrison did do was, to reply to Lord Salisbury, in proper phrase, that he should maintain the dignity and honor of his country and her national rights by protecting those and her property with all the resources within his power. *Nothing more.*

For that he has been severely and wantonly criticised by all the anglophobists and anglophilists in the country. Their cry is: "Such language will bring on a war with England. Would he have a war for a few seals?" No, nor many, nor for almost any amount of money that could be named, but we should have a war, if our wrongs can be rectified in no other way, for one seal or for one dollar, if the attempt is to force it from the United States by insult, contumely, and disregard of our honor and high place among the nations of the earth. And the united press of England added to these cries the aspersions on our President that he was compelled to this proposition, to sustain the honor and dignity of our country, by his desire to be re-elected to his high office, and that he acted upon that ignoble and selfish motive only. Such accusations as to the motives of our highest officer and of our ruler in foreign affairs are a gross, national insult of the vilest sort, and are indeed more provocative of war than could be the loss of the largest sum of money. This is not the first time we have suffered such insults from Great Britain, and that in the person of her high officer; it was duly resented then, as I hope may ever be the case.

Because of similar accusations made by Mr. West, the British Minister, in a private letter, that President Cleveland was actuated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by such political motives in some of his official acts, which letter was published by the recipient without the knowledge of Minister West, President Cleveland, deeming it a British insult, made representations of the matter to the British Government and asked that West be recalled, and that Government advised President Cleveland to send him home. This the President did, "without standing on the order of his going."

Before going farther, let me declare my opinion and most firm belief that a war between this country and Great Britain is impossible, because England could not be well provoked by anything that our sense of justice, our honor as a nation, and the high position we hold, would permit us to do, or allow to be done, towards any nation.

Let us see what is England's condition as regards a war with us. I admit she has a large and powerful navy on which she relies to threaten us with the piratical warfare of bombarding our cities, destroying our property, and murdering our women and children. No other nation in the world threatens to carry on a war in that way except against barbarians.

England knows that she could not land men on this continent who could stay here seven days. She did manage in the War of 1812 to land a flying party near Baltimore, which marched to Washington and destroyed our public buildings.

During all the wars of Europe, even under Napoleon, wherein quite all its capitals were occupied by invading armies, no such act of vandalism was done, and as soon as the English had done it in our case the incendiaries fled to their ships. Even Moscow was set on fire by the Russians themselves to prevent its falling into the hands of Napoleon and affording him the additional prestige that he would gain by occupying it as his winter quarters.

Great Britain is not a warlike people. She never had more than twenty-five thousand soldiers from her own islands between the four seas on any battlefield, and those were at Waterloo, while we had in our late war more than that number to starve or die of wounds or sickness in a single prison. Does any one believe that England will ever forget that at the close of our war we disbanded quite two millions of soldiers, and that half a million of them are yet alive to take a hand in any war in which the honor of our country is assailed by Great Britain? I have said, and perhaps may be criticised for it, that she is not a warlike

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation. Her government is continually making war on small nations and hiring someone else to do the fighting.

If there is anything on which England can pride herself for prowess in war it is her navy. But she cannot forget that, until almost within this generation, that navy could only be supplied with sailors sufficient to man it by dragging them from their homes by press gangs. The Marquis of Salisbury seems to have faith in bonds in settling difficulties between England and this country. Be it so. England has given this country bonds in untold millions that she will keep the peace and be of good behavior. The first gun fired in the Behring Sea by one of her war vessels against one of our war vessels would be war, as much as the first gun fired at Fort Sumter or as the Battle of Gettysburg. War abrogates all treaties of amity and commerce. War permits the confiscation of all property of one belligerent found on the shores or within the jurisdiction of the other. Every debt, demand, certificate of stock, due from an American would be at once forfeited and confiscated. Every rood of our land owned by English syndicates or subjects would be lost to her. It would seem as if we could find the means to carry on the war by selling her property in open market, and using the proceeds ; and when we hear the shells from her fleet, if we should do so, breaking the plate glass in Broadway, we should be comfortably remembering that a great deal of it belongs to English people.

Stopping the export of cotton for three months would starve Manchester and its workmen, and be of advantage to us, as cotton is very low in price and we could use it.

Let us look at some other foreign complications which are to be taken into account by England in case of war with us. Russia still has her eye on Constantinople, and might think it a good time, when England was thus crippled, to carry out her dream of empire so long and steadily maintained by her Czars. She might be deterred from entering on her purpose lest she should disturb the peace of Europe. But India lies at Russia's very door with every road opening into it, and the possession of her wheat fields would give her command of the sustenance of the Eastern Hemisphere, at a time when the superabundance of corn and wheat from the valleys of the Red River of the North and the fields of Manitoba, which now fill fifteen thousand freight cars yearly, and which pass over the Canadian railways, would be blocked by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American forces. England, indeed, would not doubt that upon land we are her superiors.

In a war by sea she must suffer far more than we. She has substantially the carrying-trade of the world, reckoning what she robbed from us during the War of the Rebellion by the aid of the rebel cruisers which she sent from her ports, and for the doing of which she humbly expressed her regrets in the most formal manner in the treaty at Washington as a preliminary to be allowed to treat with us, as follows:

"And whereas Her Britannic Majesty has authorized her high commissioners and plenipotentiaries to express, in a friendly spirit, the regret felt by Her Majesty's Government for the escape, under whatever circumstances, of the "Alabama" and other vessels from British ports, and for the depredations committed by those vessels:

"Now, in order to remove and adjust all complaints and claims on the part of the United States," etc.

Our letters of marque and reprisal (for we did not agree to the treaty of Paris, which England pressed us to adopt at the beginning of our Civil War and which put privateering under the ban of international law) would swarm out of every port, and sweep her commerce from the ocean. One thing is certain: If our ships are not as heavy as hers, they are swifter and lighter heeled, which her commercial marine would find out to its cost.

These are a few of the reasons why I cannot conceive that we can ever have a war with England; and because, also, we shall never demand anything of her but what we believe to be right, nor submit to anything from her which we believe to be wrong.

Much criticism has been expended upon President Harrison because of the honest, manly, firm, and unflinching declaration that no interference with our rights would be permitted while our case was being tried. This was called "Jingoism," and it was said that it was only done by him for selfish political purposes. The change of a single word in all that makes it high praise. It was manfully done for the *politic* purpose to maintain the honor and dignity of the country. And it has succeeded, as in the history of our diplomacy such manful presentation of our rights has always done. Let us recall to the mind of this generation that when we have had great men for Presidents, our rights have always been thus presented to every nation which has undertaken to baffle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

us by neglect, or through adroit diplomacy to postpone a fulfilment of treaty engagements.

Let us call to mind the French Spoliation claims, which had been recognized by France for more than twenty-five years before she would make a treaty to pay them, whereby those of our citizens who had been despoiled by her continuous neglect went down to their graves in poverty and distress. By treaty the French nation had promised to pay the money in yearly instalments, but neglected to answer the draft of President Jackson's Secretary of the Treasury when presented on the 23d of March, 1834, to the French Minister of Finance, who declared that no money had been appropriated for the American indemnity, and that it could not be paid.

What said President Jackson, without further diplomacy, in his message to Congress on this state of affairs? He sent a message to Congress which gave no uncertain sound. He said: "It is a principle of international law that when one nation refuses to pay a just debt, the aggrieved nation may 'seize on the property' belonging to the citizens of the defaulting nation. If, therefore, France does not pay the money at the next session of the Chambers, the United States ought to delay no longer to take by force what it can not get by negotiation." Nay, more. "Since France," said the President, "in violation of the pledges given through her minister here, has delayed her final action so long that her decision will not probably be known in time to be communicated to this Congress, I recommend that a law be passed authorizing reprisals upon French property in case provisions shall not be made for the payment of the debt at the approaching session of the French Chambers."

How was this received by the French newspapers?

"With one voice, the French newspapers, ministerial, opposition, and neutral, denounced the message as an insult to France, so gross that it would be infamy not to resent it."

The French Minister at Washington was recalled, and our Minister at Paris, Mr. Livingston, was informed that his passports were at his disposal. The President wrote to Mr. Livingston to demand his passports and come home if the Chamber of Deputies, then in session, did not appropriate the money. Congress did not sustain President Jackson. There were cowards in Congress at that day, especially in the Senate, as there have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been since. On the 14th of January the Senate resolved, without one dissenting vote: "That it is inexpedient, at present, to adopt any legislative measures in regard to the state of affairs between the United States and France."

Similar resolutions were introduced in the House, but their passage was prevented only because of technical objections. This action of Congress encouraged the Chamber of Deputies, so that it passed a bill appropriating the money to pay the instalments due, but added a condition which forbade the ministry to pay the instalment until the President had apologized for the language which he had used theretofore, and the minister drew up a form of apology for Jackson to sign. Our Congress adjourned without giving the President any money to protect the honor of the country. The President demanded of the French Government its *final* determination; and if the instalments were not paid the *chargé d'affaires* was to close the office of the legation.

After the answer was received, France prepared its army and a navy to act against the United States. Jackson sent his message to Congress, in which he said: "If this array of military force be really designed to affect the action of the government and people of the United States on the questions now pending between the two nations, then indeed would it be dishonorable to pause a moment on the alternative which such a state of affairs should present to us. Come what may, the explanation which France demands can never be accorded; and no armament however powerful and imposing at a distance or on our coast, will, I trust, deter us from discharging the high duties we owe to our constitutents, to our national character, and to the world."

After this message the people rallied around Jackson. They had stood by him from the first. He was only deserted by the sneaks and the politicians. We had one statesman—and he became a President of the United States—in the House of Representatives; and he made a speech which carried that House in support of the honor of the nation. "Sir," exclaimed Mr. Adams, "this treaty has been ratified on both sides of the ocean; it has received the sign manual of the Sovereign of France, through his Imperial Majesty's principal Minister of State; it has been ratified by the Senate of this republic; it has been sanctioned by Almighty God; and still we are told in a voice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

potential, in the other wing of this Capitol, that the arrogance of France—nay, sir, not of France, but of her Chamber of Deputies—the insolence of the French Chambers, must be submitted to, and we must come down to the lower degradation of reopening negotiations to attain that which has already been acknowledged to be our due. Sir, is this a specimen of your boasted chivalry? Is this an evidence of the existence of that heroic valor which has so often led our army on to glory and immortality? Reopen negotiations, sir, with France? Do it, and soon you will find your flag insulted, dishonored, and trodden in the dust by the pigmy States of Asia and Africa—by the very banditti of the earth."

From France came a proposition three weeks later. The President informed Congress that the government of Great Britain had offered its mediation, and that he had accepted its offer. But at the same time he notified the mediating power that "*the apology demanded by France was totally out of the question.*" On May 10 he sent the following communication to the Capitol: "Information has been received at the Treasury Department that the four instalments under our treaty with France *have been paid to the agents of the United States.*" And when this was done Jackson was applauded with the same unanimity as that with which he had been attacked for his conduct in the French affair. This is one specimen of American "Jingoism. *It has always been successful.*

We may be replied to by some gentlemen who wear whiskers of a particular pattern that this demand was not on England; that the country opposed to us was France.

Let me give another instance. During our War of the Rebellion, in the summer of 1863, when the English shipyards were building armed vessels, and the English Government allowing them to escape from their ports, to destroy our commerce and burn our whaling fleet in the far-off oceans, this Government remonstrated with England on such conduct for more than two years as a breach of neutrality and as wilfully affording aid and comfort to our enemy. Our minister was instructed to present in the strongest language this unfriendliness and injustice to us. Meanwhile two ironclad rams were being built at the Laird shipyards, under pretence that one was for Egypt and the other for France. But it was known to our government that they were intended to come

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on to our coast to destroy our blockading fleet, or to raise the siege of Charleston. If that were done the English blockade runners would carry on British trade at a profit, just as the Canadian poachers can now steal seals at a profit.

At last, after our minister had exhausted all power of reasoning and remonstrance with Lord John Russell, the British premier, to have these rams interdicted by Britain from leaving the port of Liverpool, and Mr. Adams had reported that he could do nothing to have these rams kept in England, it was currently reported here that at a cabinet consultation President Lincoln took his pencil and wrote on a visiting card directed to Mr. Adams: "Tell Lord John Russell that another 'Alabama' is war." On September 5, 1863, although Mr. Adams had never before even hinted anything about the acts of England being war, in accordance with Mr. Seward's despatch of July 11, 1863, Mr. Adams says to Lord John Russell, after calling his lordship's attention to what was proposed to be done by these rams so escaping: "It would be superfluous to point out to Your Lordship that *this is war.*" Three days afterwards he received the following despatch: "Lord Russell presents his compliments to Mr. Adams, and has the honor to inform him that instructions have been issued which will prevent the departure of the two iron-clad vessels from Liverpool." *So no more "Alabamas."*

Manly diplomacy once more succeeds, and against England, too, when she was stronger and we were weaker than either will ever happen to be again. It destroyed her favorite project of sweeping our commerce from the seas by means of rebel privateers sailing from her ports, which she had schemed for since May, 1861, when she had offered to Jeff. Davis to adopt the treaty of Paris. She urged our Government also to accept this measure, which forbade privateering, pledging to Davis that it should not apply to his rebel privateers, concealing from our Government and its diplomatic corps that she was in diplomatic correspondence with the rebel chief as a belligerent, before we had acknowledged such belligerency.

It has been difficult to deal in this paper with the status of the Behring Sea controversy, because, as I have been writing, the two governments were acting upon it by telegraph. One day war seemed to threaten, and almost the next the treaty was to be ratified. On one day Earl Salisbury is in an aggressive attitude;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he receives the bold presentation of our ultimatum ; he replies to it at first adversely and defiantly, and, to speak plainly, insultingly, because he proposes to change the negotiation on our part to one with Canadian seal poachers to get their bonds to pay the damages for which we hold England responsible. The President's answer to that, is to reiterate his ultimatum that the *modus vivendi* must be maintained during the arbitration, or we will defend and protect ourselves at all hazards and with all our resources. The next day the Earl Salisbury sends a note receding from his position, which he discloses to Parliament and receives cheers for so doing. The Senate of the United States at once, as well they might have done before, ratified the treaty unanimously, and the arbitration is to go on, the seals are to be guarded by both nations, and the Canadian seal poachers are to be arrested, and all things are to remain *in statu quo* until the award of the arbitrators. The views of our contentions change as suddenly as the scenes of a kaleidoscope ; not, however, with any of their beauty.

The treaty providing for the arbitration ought to have been ratified because our government had agreed so to do. Nations as well as individuals should fully and thoroughly carry out every contract, however informally concluded. I have not said and do not say, because I do not believe, that the arbitration should have ever been originally agreed upon.

In almost every instance where we have had an arbitration with Great Britain we have got the worst of it. Space will only allow me to give one or two instances of this fact. In the matter of our "national losses" because of the misconduct of England in our Civil War an arbitrament established by the treaty of Washington was held at Geneva. When we presented our case before the arbitrators, England refused to go on with the hearing until we would abandon all our claims to national losses (such as having our commerce destroyed, our war prolonged, and its expenses largely increased), and demanded that they should be withdrawn from the consideration of that tribunal, and that the United States confine its case to claims of its private citizens for injuries done to them, and we were not allowed to present even our claim for the sinking of the public warship "Hatteras" by the pirate "Alabama," for whose escape from England, under whatever circumstances, England had expressed her regret, as we have seen. Our government was weak enough to agree to withdraw our national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claims, "and present only the losses suffered by our citizens" as national losses. It is true the arbitration gave us some fifteen and a half millions without interest for all that this nation suffered at the hands of England during the war. Who got the worst of it by this arbitration?

There was another arbitration provided for in the treaty of Washington. England made claims against us for the value of the fish our fishermen on the northeast coast had caught, certain mackerel swimming in the sea within three miles of the Canadian shores. We agreed to arbitrate that claim with England, to be submitted to three men, one appointed by us, one by England, and one to be agreed on by the parties, or else appointed by some foreign power, the award of whom, that is, all three agreeing to it, was to be binding on the parties. England chose a very able gentleman from Canada; we appointed a gentleman from Massachusetts, a country lawyer who had probably never seen a mackerel until it was boiled; and England proposed the name of Del Fosse, who represented Belgium here. But Mr. Fish would not agree to him because Belgium was substantially only a province of England. Whereupon the appointment had to be submitted to the representative of Austria at London, and he very promptly nominated Del Fosse. The arbitrators met, the case was heard; Del Fosse and the Canadian arbitrator being a majority awarded the sum of five million five hundred thousand dollars, something like one-third of all that had been awarded us by the Geneva tribunal for all the losses we had suffered through the misconduct of England during the war. And although the award was not agreed to or signed by our arbitrator, through the performances of our Secretary of State under Johnson this money was paid for a few fish swimming in the sea in the northern waters of Canada, the right to catch which we had enjoyed as Colonists; and in the treaty of peace of 1783 these rights were secured to us by the War of the Revolution, by the manly courage of John Adams, who declared that he would allow the war to go on rather than surrender the right, which was clearly ours, to fish in the seas.

Now, by this arbitration, a majority of the arbitrators of our rights in the Behring Sea are to be chosen by England and other European powers (she has been careful this time), and the treaty provides that the award of the majority is to be binding. The English newspapers are early in discussing as to whom the Euro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pean countries (who, with England, are to appoint such majority of arbitrators) will appoint, and they congratulate themselves that England is safe. I agree with them. *She is safe.* And I therefore say that the arbitration ought not to have been made.

The arbitrament was proposed by England.

B. F. BUTLER.

THE MARQUIS OF LORNE:

A STRANGE North land, a weird North water is that Alaskan region, that part of the Pacific called the Behring Sea, on the American side; a main land rising into vast plateaux and cones, and furrowed for the passage of streams, great even when measured by the wide scale of America; a giant limit of the mountain chains that wall off the Pacific along all its Eastern side, save in the low-lying centre part near Panama, and here, in the far north, broken away into hundreds of islands, large and small, from the great breakwater of Vancouver, to the lonely rock inhabited only by puffins and gulls. Wide as is the Archipelago along the British Columbian shore, it still sows the Alaskan water with all imaginable shapes in a still formidable multitude of isles, and then threads away into the long string which shows that in other days a chain of hills ran out towards Asia. Now only the broken fragments show like a ruined and submerged rampart, and in front of them is a mighty force—a deep trench in the ocean flow, as though it had been dug to make unscaleable the rocky walls of the primeval ruin. It is these far-away retreats which are the best loved by hunted seals, about whom so much is now written. If we could only persuade American and British ladies to let these seals have a *modus vivendi*, or chance of life, for a few years, how grateful they would be; but as this involves the buying of no new seal jackets for at least two or three years, what hope is there for them? Yes; if President and Prime Minister are now discussing with earnestness how to preserve the existence of the seals, it is a case again of "*cherchez la femme;*" for the pursuit of these seals is a profitable business, and nobody likes to drop it.

The company which has the sole right of killing seals on land has its men ever ready to watch them as they land, and to cut off their retreat to the sea as they are comfortably dozing on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rocks, and drive them inland to the slaughter ground, where they club them to death.

The so-called "pelajee," or ocean hunter, intercepts the seals on their way to the islands, and in fog and wet kills them in the water. Dreary-looking places the breeding grounds are, for there is not a single tree to be seen on these rocky masses lifted out of the gray sea. A white fog constantly broods around them, and the air is so moist that in the winter, when there is any frost, each rock face on a hillside is seamed like a comb with icicles. This dampness produces the only beauty in their coloring, for the grass is often long and very green. The Indians are an ugly race, but have skill in fishing, and have long ago learned the value of furs, and the use of guns and nets.

One of the ablest of American statesmen is said to have remarked to an English friend: "Sir, whenever the British government has had any difference with foreign countries, it has been observed that opinion here at Washington is on the British side. Yes, sir, we are always with you, except, curiously enough, in the event of any dispute between ourselves and you!" It may be doubted, in the matter of the Behring Sea contention, whether even this exception holds good. There can be very little doubt that the vast majority of American citizens believe, and, we may add, every distinguished lawyer in the United States backs the opinion, that there can be no warrant for the barring of the open sea, and for the exclusive power of fishing or of hunting therein.

When Russia made over to the American government her territory opposite Siberia, Uncle Sam made an investment which a Scotsman would have called "buying a pig in a poke." Something was bought with something else inside of it, and that was about all that was accurately known of the transaction.

To be sure there were maps, with a bewildering number of islands and "shadowy promontories" marked upon them, and it was also obvious that these studded a sea giving access to that mysterious Arctic Ocean, which each nation in turn burns to enter with a view of reaching the North Pole. But it was not, it is believed, with a view to the exclusive possession of the highway to that magnetic attraction that the United States invested its dollars. Information was rather vague as to the region purchased. It was painted to the imagination as most interesting. Its fogs were very clearly described, and it was known to have a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fair amount of winter, snow, and frost, although these advantages failed when compared with the rival attractions in the same line enjoyed by New England. But volcanoes formed an entirely novel acquisition for Uncle Sam. He had never enjoyed the possession of a real live mountain before. He, therefore, now put several into his pocket, with a sensation that the Monroe doctrine had at last led to something real. Then there were glaciers also, and this rather roused the spirit of local protection among the producers and consumers of Wenham ice. But it was agreed that, although the purchase of so much waste land and water, peopled only by a few Indians and a selection of Russian half-breeds, would not return any dividends, the acquisition was interesting. And it has, at all events, produced one of those small but irritating contentions which will always arise where commercial companies employ their fishermen or hunters in the chase.

Scientific interest as well as commercial gain has stimulated the attention paid to the hunting in the North Pacific—for the sea otter, the sea lion, and the fur seal are creatures only found to-day in large numbers in these regions.

On the Atlantic there has been for many years so indiscriminate and imprudent a slaughter of walrus, seal, and salmon, as well as of other fish, that all hope of re-stocking the walrus and seal haunts near the coasts has disappeared ; and the efforts of scientists are busily occupied with attempts to re-stock the rivers with salmon and even the sea banks with valuable sea fish.

It is probably this fact which has led American scientists to lay in some instances an undue stress on the chances that the fur seal may be exterminated. Certainly the fur seals have disappeared from the shores of the Southern Hemisphere, where they were formerly to be found in abundance. In the Southern Pacific there was no "catch" of seals taken at sea. They were slaughtered only on the islands and shores where they formed their "rookeries." It was the slaughter made in these places, where they were comparatively helpless, that caused them to disappear. The experience of the South will certainly be repeated in the North were the same tactics to be employed. Indeed, the ease with which the animals can be taken on land has induced Russians and Americans to endeavor to monopolize the profits by allowing the seals to be caught on the islands only. The fishing proper has been done by schooners, the number of which has only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this year reached fifty, in which the seal is pursued in the open sea, that is, more than three miles from shore when off the American coasts. It is obvious that the means of destruction used on this limited scale are wholly insufficient to work much damage to the herds on their way to the islands. Once on the islands and their immediate neighborhood, the preservation or destruction of the herds depends solely on the regulations under which the American Company, the lessee of the islands from the Government, conducts its operations.

It is natural that, with the lessons of destruction of life seen on the Atlantic side, the scientists should be inclined to support the interested representations of the monopolists connected with the American Company in deprecating any chase of the seal at sea. But it will be apparent that, whereas on the Atlantic the instruments of destruction have been used for generations, the machinery for fishing and for the chase is so feeble on the Pacific side that this fear is groundless and cannot apply to the case.

It is the interest and desire of all parties having, or likely to have, a share in valuable animal life to preserve it according to the light of scientific knowledge,—for, as the farmer says, the amount of "cropping must depend on the quality of the soil."

Dr. Dawson, who, with Sir George Baden Powell, examined the Behring Sea, and all the fishermen who could give pertinent evidence, declare in the strongest terms that the present sealer outfit is not sufficient to hurt the herds for another year, at all events. They have come to this conclusion after much trouble and much travel, and Dr. Dawson's testimony is evidence that will be held in respect by all American scientists.

But what was not expected has happened in that the fisheries turn out to be likely of infinitely greater value than the most hopeful imagined. The codfish appear to be the same as our old friends of the Atlantic; although the salmon are all widely different in look from their Atlantic cousin, and, as most people think, very inferior in flavor. There seems, however, to be no inferiority in the cod, and the banks on which they are found are nearly equal in extent to those around Newfoundland. They may be larger, for they are not yet fully surveyed, but it is computed that there are 100,000 square miles of fishing ground.

Of course, if the sea were not an open sea, all this cod fishery

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might also be given off to some one company with monopoly rights. Nobody doubts that seals landing on islands or mainland shores, or swimming in water within the three-mile limit of the coast, are the property of the landowners, but away at sea there can be no more property in them than in the salmon which come regularly to certain rivers and then become landowners' property, but are anybody's game when on their way to the rivers and out at sea. This has been on other occasions insisted on by American jurists.

Mr. Adams, of the United States, in 1822 wrote: "The pretensions of the Russian (Imperial) Government extend to an exclusive territorial jurisdiction from the 45th degree of north latitude on the Asiatic coast to the latitude of 51 north on the west coast of the American continent, and they assume the right of interdicting the navigation and the fishing of all other nations to the extent of one hundred miles from the whole of the coast. *The United States can admit no part of these claims.*"

A little later Mr. Adams again said: "The right of navigation and of fishing in the Pacific Ocean, even upon the Asiatic coast north of latitude 45 degrees, can as little be interdicted to the United States as that of traffic with the natives of North America." President Angell, a great American authority, says: "On what grounds, and after what modern precedent, we (the United States) could set up a claim to hold this great sea, with its wide approaches, as a 'mare clausum,' it is not easy to see." Again he says: "Our government has never formally set up the claim that it is a closed sea. Governor Boutwell in 1872 said: 'I do not see that the United States could have the jurisdiction or power to drive off parties going up there for that purpose, unless they made such attempt within a marine league of the shore.'" He rightly concludes in reference to the preservation of the seals: "It cannot be difficult to make some satisfactory adjustment of this question." Professor Geffcken, of Germany, a most able and impartial critic, takes precisely the same view.

British seamen in the last century hunted and fished in Behring Sea. The right was insisted on by Great Britain in the convention made with Russia in 1825 in connection with matters affecting this very sea. The first article declared: "It is agreed that the respective subjects of the high contracting parties shall not be troubled or molested in any part of the ocean called the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pacific Ocean, either in navigating the same, in fishing therein, or in landing at such parts of the coast as shall not have been already occupied." Great Britain always declared that the Pacific Ocean embraced Behring Sea, and that Russia could not close it. And in 1887, an American Government official, in contending that the seizure by Russia of an American vessel was illegal, notes that "the Russian code of prize law of 1869 limits the jurisdictional waters of Russia to three miles from the shore."

Neither Britain nor any other maritime nation could have recognized any monopoly in any sea beyond the three-mile limit. The Russian company's monopoly could only extend to the land and its immediate neighborhood, and that was quite sufficiently valuable, specially as to the seal-fur trade, to make the highest in Russia, whether by rank or fortune, eager to become shareholders in so lucrative an enterprise. In early days, too, the competition there was not keen, and the mere absence of fishing and sealing vessels cannot, of course, be held to imply that they came not because they were forbidden to do so. They came not, because they knew not of the value of the harvest they might gather. The way was long to the field, and there were no ready markets at hand.

Wide salt water has always been open to all keels, and no imaginary claims of exclusion, derived from half barbarous times, can invalidate this world-wide freedom, which it is equally to the advantage of all maritime nations to enjoy.

Likewise good regulations as to close times should be mutually arranged, so that the supply of fish or sea animals be not exhausted. Now it is absolutely denied on the strongest evidence that any "rookery" or seal colony has ever been destroyed, depleted, or even injured, by the killing of seals at sea only, whereas it is proved that the heavy slaughter on the land where the seals congregate has caused the seals to vanish from several places where they formerly were to be found in thousands. It stands to reason that a moderate use of both methods of hunting is what ought to be enforced. Just as the oyster supply dredged up by the fishermen is regulated at the ancient British Burgh of Whitstable by the state of the market, so ought international arrangements to be made to check any over-heavy draft on the vitality of the seal herds, as observed from year to year.

During last year eye-witnesses of the highest character have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

declared that the seals are abundant, and that there is no necessity that a fair number should not be taken, both from the islands and from the ocean. The arbitration of this year will enable the governments concerned to make regulations for future years, which shall put each neighbor on the Pacific in a position to use wisely and with a view to future profit the annual migration of the seal herds.

It is well to remember that the only debatable point which delayed the ratification of the Arbitration Treaty by the Senate is a very small one, and refers only to the single season's hunting by no great number of vessels. While men of indubitable probity declare that this cannot injure a property, the value of which consists chiefly in a right, which cannot be assailed, to catch the seals on shore, it seems unnecessary to have any further delay in concluding the reference to arbitration. This arbitration will decide the more important matter of the right of a maritime power to close any portion of the ocean to the citizens of other nations. Some complaints of delay have arisen on both sides, but it is certain that the British have expedited the correspondence as far as practicable, and it is, indeed, only natural that both sides should desire the settlement of a question which cannot be said to involve the permanent national interests of either party. The United States believes that it purchased certain rights from the Russians. These are only in part questioned by those who fully admit all rights as to land ownership, but object only to be deprived of that which not only the British, but all other maritime people, claim as common property, namely, the right to hunt at will over the unenclosed length and breadth of the ocean itself.

When the arbitration has done its work the seal-fishing industry must be protected by a sensible close time, giving the subjects of the United States and Britain each the power to use and not to abuse the advantages given by the northern migration of the fur seal. It is incompatible with any international comity that one power alone can patrol the open sea. Other nations—Russia, France, Germany, or any that may be named—have a right to the navigation of these waters, and it is primarily in the interest of the powers having harbors in the more immediate neighborhood that provision should be mutually made for the preservation of the seal species, not by the dragging in of ancient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alleged Russian exclusive privileges, but by the sensible delimitation of seasons for hunting, based on scientific investigation, which shall be impartial and founded on painstaking observation and practical experience. The fair solution of this matter is the extension of the principle of arbitration already agreed on, so that compensation shall be given for any property taken in contrariety to the ultimate award of the arbitrators on either side, and the future determination to avoid that waste which would injure alike the subjects of the London and the Washington governments.

LORNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARTY GOVERNMENT ON ITS TRIAL.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L.

A STRANGER visiting Washington at this time is told, and would soon learn for himself, that there is little thought or prospect in Congress of national legislation during the present session. The soul of the legislature is absorbed by the coming party fight for the Presidency. The two parties lie watching each other's movements like two hostile armies, manœuvering each of them for any coigne of vantage, and looking out anxiously for opportunities of discrediting its rival. Of the national interest every one admits that there is little care. Even such questions as that of commercial relations with Canada, which involve no party issue, are at a standstill, because the joint action for which they call is impossible, neither of the parties being able to trust the good faith of the other. The constitution has been practically suspended by the party machines, and the party machines are at a dead-lock. It is doubly a dead-lock, because the House being in the hands of one party and the Senate in those of the other, what one branch of the legislature passes the other is sure, on party grounds, to reject. Thanks to a strong intervention of national good sense outside Congress, finding its organs in the press, the country appears to have come safe through the crisis of the Silver Bill, and to have escaped those well-known results of a decayed and depreciated currency, an experience of which led Tom Paine, no strait-laced economist, seriously to propose that the penalty for any attempt to repeat the experiment should be death.

But it is on party spirit probably that the main responsibility rests for the existence of the peril, and for any loss or inconvenience that it may already have brought on industry and trade. The silver men and the silver States had an intelligible motive of their own, but it is not likely that of men so shrewd as the mem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bers of the American legislature many were the victims of the silver fallacy. Most, we are told and may well believe, were simply yielding to an apparent party exigency in voting with the silver States. The Executive is almost as completely paralyzed as the legislature. It can hardly move in any direction for fear of estranging from the party some sectional or local vote. Even in the diplomatic field, where if anywhere patriotism ought to prevail over party, the Executive, while it is struggling against a foreign power for the rights of the country, is embarrassed in its action by party opposition and traduced before its foreign adversaries and the world at large by party animosity. At a crisis which seems to threaten war experts declare that the country is defenceless, and if you ask how it comes to pass that the United States are without a navy, that their coasts lie exposed to assault and their wealthy cities to devastation, while a sum larger than the entire military expenditure of first-rate war powers is spent in army pensions, the answer is that ships of war cannot turn the party scale by their votes. Amidst the distractions and fluctuations of party anything like a steady and farsighted policy in external affairs becomes almost impossible. The treatment of the Canadian question, for instance, is a history of vacillation and irresolution, of policies adopted in the national interest, and vetoed by some local or personal interest which party courts or fears. There is reason to apprehend that the question may remain unsolved, and that a power antagonistic to the American Republic may thus be allowed to form itself under the auspices of European Toryism in the north of this Continent, though by that result a stain would be brought on American statesmanship deeper even than that which was brought on it by its failure to solve the question of slavery, since the question of slavery was not certainly capable of satisfactory solution, whereas the Canadian question certainly is. A railway company which derives a great part of its earnings from trade carried on within American territory, from American connections and from privileges enjoyed under American jurisdiction over its American competitors, is allowed with impunity to make itself an engine of estrangement between Canada and the United States and of Tory designs against American institutions, because party demands the support of certain localities or commercial circles which prefer their own interest to the interest and honor of the country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A distinguished member of the Republican party has been heard to say that he was against the admission of Canada into the Union because he believed she would "vote Democratic." He might as well have said that she would vote Guelph or Ghibelin. But the avowal proved that in his breast, and probably not in his breast alone, party had triumphed over national aspiration, and over the plain dictates of American statesmanship, of which the highest objects must be the unity, independence, and security of this continent.

Not to the people of the United States alone come these loud warnings. Disclosures in Canada have revealed and and are still revealing the political condition to which the same system has brought us there. By nature no people are worthier than the yeomen, merchants, and artisans of Canada; nor could there have been a more promising basis for free institutions than their character affords. Their social and commercial morality is still grand, though it can hardly remain forever unaffected by the example of immorality in the government. Confederation brought with it a vast extension of the party system, and all that it draws in its train. The result, as we see, is a domination of knavery and corruption. The machine has been worked unsparingly and by first-rate hands. One of Sir John Macdonald's merry sayings was that the best cabinet would be one consisting of twelve mediocrities, each of whom you could, if you liked, put in the penitentiary. He made, as we see, and Canada finds to her sorrow, progress towards the realization of his ideal. The natural effects have been produced upon the political character of the people. Direct bribery prevails to a lamentable extent, and has been largely employed by the government in the recent elections. Government candidates hold out, with the coarsest effrontery, promises of jobs to the constituencies, and by those promises they prevail. Conviction of public theft has almost ceased to be a political disqualification. A member branded with it by a resolution of the House of Commons, returns to his constituents, avows his act, pleads that he is no worse than the rest, and is re-elected. A member of the Cabinet, about whose guilt there is no moral doubt, receives not only a whitewashing but an ovation. If Mr. Mercier had not opposed the Dominion Government in an election there would have been no inquiry into his malversations, and, as it was, his overthrow was probably due

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not more to his being corrupt than to his having lost the means of corruption. His censor and assailants were at the same time practising corruption on the largest scale. All this is party.

But the grand example is England. Let those who believe in party government as the best of all systems, or as our inevitable destiny to the end of political time, look across the Atlantic to the classical land of party and see what it is doing there.

Whether Home Rule for Ireland be good or not, nobody can doubt that it is a measure of tremendous import. If it led to separation, as probably it would, and as Mr. Parnell manifestly intended that it should, the ultimate result would be either the fall of the British power, or the re-conquest of Ireland, and a fresh cycle of woes; its immediate consequence would be the delivery of Ireland to the priests and the overthrow of national education. It apparently involves a dishonorable desertion of the Irish Protestants, who are stretching out their hands to England in protest. A more momentous step it would be impossible for British statesmen to take. Yet party is willing to take it for the sake of ousting hated opponents and regaining power. Bright truly said that there were not among Mr. Gladstone's followers, outside of the Irish section, twenty men who approved his bill. The rest were voting for party, and at the bidding of its caucus, a few months before, they had been Unionists supporting a Coercion Act more stringent than those which they afterwards denounced as tyranny, applauding the arrest of Mr. Parnell and of scores of his followers, and cheering when he was branded as a conspirator wading through dismemberment to rapine. Such they had been, and so they had continued to act till the result of a general election made it clear that without the Parnellite vote their party could not regain power. Not only their views of policy but their views of history were changed when party gave the word, and Pitt's great achievement, the Union, lauded by them before as equal in beneficence to his fiscal reforms, suddenly became an injury, while admiration was transferred from its author to the patriots of Vinegar Hill. Even British respect for law was thrown aside; agrarian outrage was palliated if not encouraged, and a peasantry highly excitable, and very bloodthirsty when excited, was exhorted to remember scenes of blood.

Party it is which is ready and eager to throw the United Kingdom into the smelting pot, to cover its past with dishonor,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and expose it to mortal peril in the future, for the sake of a victory over rivals and restoration to power. Home Rule, with the manifest possibility of dismemberment or civil war in its train, is the price offered for the Irish vote. Even the aid of foreign enemies, as the American Fenians proved themselves to be, is not disdained by party maddened with the strife for power. Little cause have British statesmen to point the finger of scorn at the fishers for that same vote in the political waters of the United States.

But of the price which party in England offers for return to office Home Rule is now but one item. It offers church dis-establishment, though its leader has been, throughout his life, of all upholders of church establishment the most eminent, and the one who defended it on the highest ground of principle. It offers measures of economic change, socialistic in their tendency, of indefinite extent, and holds out to the proletariat a hope of something like legislative confiscation of the property of the rich. When an arch wire-puller like Mr. Schnadhorst calls a convention of agricultural laborers, appeals to their discontent, stirs up their class feeling against the landowner, and promises them in effect a redivision of the land, can it be supposed that his real object is economical justice? His real object, manifestly, is to gain for his party the agricultural laborer's vote. If he can do this, he is ready to set rural society in a flame. The other party understands his move, and feebly attempts to outflank him by holding an agricultural convention of its own. On all sides, men who have hitherto posed as sound economists and political philosophers, now carried away by the frenzy of the strife, are dangling before an enfranchised proletariat hopes of a redistribution of wealth by socialistic legislation, which they must know to be deceptive, and, if entertained by the masses, pregnant with the danger of social war. Party is at the bottom of it all.

Sweeping measures of political change are tendered at the same time and with the same object. The House of Lords is to be abolished or reduced to impotence, while no constitutional check or balance in the nature of a Senate is proposed in its room. The last limitations of the franchise are to be swept away. Any minor safeguards which wealth or intelligence still retain in the electoral field are to be destroyed. The Septennial Act is to be repealed. Parliaments are to be made triennial or perhaps annual,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and thus the House of Commons, in which now whatever is left of authority resides, and which is practically not only the legislature but the government of the country, is to be reduced to a mere slave and organ of the popular will. This result has indeed been to a great extent brought about already by the operation of the local caucus for elections introduced by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, but the repeal of the Septennial Act would complete the work. There would thenceforth be no authority but that of the local caucus, or of the collective local caucuses under a general organization managed by some national boss like Mr. Schnadhorst.

The last bid of party for power, however, is perhaps the most desperate of all. It is the payment of Members of Parliament, coupled with the assumption by the State, of all the expenses of elections. The conservative portions of the British Constitution generally have become names and shadows, though they still impose to a surprising and fatal extent on the imagination of British statesmen, luring them into sweeping measures of suffrage extension and other concessions to democracy, which they fancy are safe because there is legally a crown with a royal veto, and an Upper House of Parliament; as though the veto of the crown had not long been practically extinct, or the House of Lords were like the American Senate, a really coördinate branch of the legislature. But two conservative institutions of a practical character have hitherto survived, and have been real barriers against democracy, which otherwise would have come in like a flood, bridled by no limitations such as are imposed on it by the written constitution of the United States. These two institutions are the non-payment of members of the House of Commons and the liability of the candidate for the expense of election. Living in London being costly, and involving the abandonment in the case of country members of their business or calling, has confined the representation generally to men of independent means. The few representatives of labor who have found seats in the House are maintained, sometimes rather grudgingly, out of the trade fund, while the Irish members are maintained out of a political fund which has been apparently on the point of failing. Election expenditure also, though reduced, is still considerable. The two barriers together have hitherto sufficed to exclude generally from the House of Commons those whose object in entering public life is to eat a piece of bread. But now the Gladstonians are promis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing payment of members and the assumption of election expenses by the State. Among the Gladstonians in Parliament not a few are rich members for manufacturing districts, whose radicalism may be not uncharitably suspected to be partly donned for the sake of the seats which are objects of their social ambition. It must be with secret bitterness of heart that these men consent to the payment of members, knowing, as they do, that they sign the warrant for their own deposition in favor of the demagogues who will make politics their trade. But party gives the word, and they must obey. Apart from the interest of their own ambition, such men can scarcely fail to feel a pang at the thought of the hands into which they are delivering the country and the Empire. The agricultural laborer is a worthy man in his way, and by his sturdy toil has made English fields bear unrivalled harvests; but he is as ignorant of all political questions as the team he drives, and his only idea is voting for the party which will give him three acres and a cow. The factory hands, who predominate in the electorate of the north of England, are far superior to the farm laborer in intelligence, but for the most part citizens of the labor market rather than of their own country, caring for little but increase of their wages and the material enjoyments which it will bring to solace lives of dull, monotonous toil; impregnated moreover with socialistic sentiment, open in their state of half education to economical fallacies, and animated by class feeling against the capitalist, who lives apart from them in his suburban villa, and whom they are taught by labor journalists and orators to regard as the "spoiler" of their "toil." The Irish peasantry and the populace of Irish cities are thoroughly disaffected, and they have eighty seats in their hands. To a sovereign people composed of such political elements, or to the demagogues who can get control over it, payment of members and assumption of election expenses by the State will consign the direct rule not only of the British Islands, but of the two hundred and fifty millions of British India and all the other dependencies of the Empire. Political madness, it would seem, could scarcely go further. But what is so mad as faction at a crisis for the struggle for power! The excitement of ordinary gambling is individual, that of faction is intensified by contagion. A strange sight it is, that of a highly-civilized, wealthy, refined, and luxurious community thus calling in the barbarians, and plucking a social revolution on its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own head, to satisfy the desperate ambition or the party animosity of a small number of its members.

Nothing short of a revolution, political, religious, social, and economical, is the price now bid by a party in England for a change of government. Nor is this all. Violent efforts have been made to wreck the House of Commons itself or force on its dissolution by the practice of obstruction, and in this an active part has been played by men who have all their lives figured as scientific publicists and calm speculators in politics, but have lost their self-control and philosophy in the fury of the faction fight. That House, which was once the model and the guiding light of deliberative assemblies throughout the world, has thus been reduced to a state in which deliberation is hopeless and even the common decencies of debate can no longer be upheld. If the minority will not let the majority govern, there is an end of parliamentary government. It is no longer a contest of party; it is morally a civil war. Had Lord Salisbury been the man for the situation, he would have taken up the gauntlet thus thrown down by the recklessnesses of the opposition. Having a great majority behind him and the public force in his hands, he would have passed, if necessary, by the application of the cloture, such measures as might have redressed the balance of the constitution, restored the authority of the House of Commons, taken legislation and government from under the feet of Mr. Schnadhorst, and effectually shut the door against revolution. But Lord Salisbury, though a man of the highest reputation for ability, was not the man for the situation. He is a diplomatist, rather than a statesman. To the great political problems which he was called upon to solve, he seems never to have seriously given his mind. His one political aim seems to be the preservation of the House of Lords. For this he is ready to pay by concessions to Socialism, which only serve to whet its appetite while they compromise the principles and shake the nerve of his own party.

It is right to say that one side has sinned almost as much as the other. Obstruction was first practised by Lord Randolph Churchill, who, in his essay on "Elijah's Mantle" proving himself indisputably the heir of Disraeli, avowed with astonishing frankness that, in party warfare, he thought of nothing but success, leaving moralists to say what they pleased. The present series of disasters began with the unprincipled coalition brought on by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Randolph between the Tories and the Parnellites for the overthrow of the Gladstone government. Nothing in the whole of this disgraceful history is more disgraceful than the abandonment of the Crimes Act by the Tories, in requital for Parnellite support, and the language of their leaders in the Commons in what was called the Mamtrasna debate.

Another liability of the party system displayed in a strong light by these events is the growing power of sectionalism. Any selfish or fanatical section which will devote itself exclusively to its own interest or its own fancy, regardless of the general good, can by playing on the balance of parties lay both parties and the national government at its feet. The Home Rulers have only eighty votes out of six hundred and sixty in the House of Commons. Yet, by sectional action they made themselves masters of the situation, and are now in a fair way to carry a measure, fraught with tremendous consequences to the country, which has not one-sixth of the House, themselves included, really in its favor.

Assemblies still styled deliberative have entirely ceased to deliberate. They have become mere battlefields on which the missiles of party argument and invective are interchanged between the two hostile hosts. If a semblance of the deliberative character anywhere remains it is perhaps in the American Senate.

The great sponsor for the morality and the necessity of party is Burke, whose words in "Thoughts on the Present Discontents" have been cited a thousand times. Burke is a magnificent writer, but unless read with reference to time and circumstance he is very apt to mislead. He is the Prince of Pamphleteers, but he is a pamphleteer, and, like all pamphleteers, to some extent makes his philosophy for the occasion. "Thoughts on the Present Discontents" is the manifesto of the Rockingham connection of Whigs against the cabal of "King's Friends," who were striving to put an end to constitutional government and instal the personal government of George III. in its place by backstairs intrigue, jobbery and corruption. To vindicate any connection of constitutional statesmen against backstairs intrigue, jobbery, corruption, and the personal government of George III. was not difficult. But as a general vindication of the party system, if it was so intended, this renowned passage will not bear examination. "Party," says Burke, "is a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavors the national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interest upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed." The particular principle apparently can be nothing but their joint opinion on the great question or questions of the day. But the great question or questions of the day will in time be settled. When they shall have been settled, what will there be to render the bond of party moral or rational; what will there be left to hold the connection together but the common desire of political power and pelf? The party will then become a machine, and its cohesion will be maintained either by mere personal association or by motives and influences more or less corrupt. By the philosophy which is always forthcoming in defence of existing arrangements, particularly those arrangements in which many persons have an active interest, it has been alleged that men are naturally and almost providentially divided from their birth into conservatives and liberals. But this bi-section of humanity is a politician's dream. Temperaments vary through an infinite series of gradations, and the same man is conservative on one subject and liberal on another. Youth as a rule, perhaps, is prone to innovation, while age is reactionary. Yet nobody is so violently reactionary as a young aristocrat. Is the community then to be artificially divided into two sections, at perpetual war with each other, for the purpose of carrying on the system? How is the apportionment to be made, and why, if the existence of the two parties is necessary, should each of them be always traducing and striving to annihilate the other? Burke's glowing language about a generous contention for power on manly and honorable maxims, and without proscription of opponents, sounds like a satire on party politics as they are. The reality is that which he would exclude by contrast,—"delusion of the ignorant by professions incompatible with human practice and followed by practices below the level of vulgar rectitude." If he could only have seen the machine and the bosses! If he could only have looked into the office of Mr. Schnadhorst! If he could only have been present at a nominating convention for the Presidency or witnessed a general election in the England of these days! A convention of Whig magnates gathered round the dinner table of the Marquis of Rockingham to settle the policy of the connection, and distribute the pocket-boroughs at its command, was the only sort of convention that he had ever seen. Party, unless there is some great question, such as parliamentary reform or slavery, to justify its existence,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be nothing but a fine name for faction, of which the ties are passion and corruption, and which always must be in the end, as it always has been, the ruin of the commonwealth.

Yet how under the representative and elective system are we to dispense with the party machine? There is the problem. How are the individual votes to be combined and directed so as to elect the representatives and form the basis for the government? It is clear they cannot combine or direct themselves. The electors in any but the smallest constituency know nothing of each other, nor have they any opportunity of conference or communication of any sort. There is in them no organ of spontaneous initiation, no faculty of collective choice or action. The theory is that they lay their heads together to choose the best man. The fact is that they can do nothing of the kind. In England, which all the world has fancied itself to be copying, the members for counties were originally elected in the county court and the members for boroughs in the town hall. There was a conference and a real election, though the influence of the leading men no doubt determined the choice. A semblance of the original institution remains in the nomination at the hustings, which is followed by the demand for a poll. When the poll had become the real election in England the nomination was long made in some conclave of municipal or local grandees. Now there is nothing to nominate the candidates and to organize the votes, but the machine; and without something to nominate the candidates and to organize the votes how can an election be made? Take away the machine, and the electorate will be so many grains of political sand without power of self determination or cohesion. The "Mugwumps" cannot nominate or elect, because they have no machine. They can do nothing but flit backwards and forwards from one machine to the other, to the great discontent of the managers of both. It is curious that so simple a point should never have presented itself to any of the framers of elective institutions. British statesmen have just given an elective council to London, as though it were possible for those five millions of citizens to lay their heads together and elect. The election will inevitably fall into the hands of the ward politicians and the wire-puller.

This opens a still deeper question. The framers of the American Constitution erred plainly enough in taking the legal and Blackstonian version of their British model as practically true,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assuming that the King was the real executive, and that the House of Lords was a branch of the legislature coördinate with the House of Commons. They erred in fancying, with Montesquieu, that the executive, legislative and judicial powers under the British Constitution were really independent of each other. Their imitation is impressed with these misconceptions. But a still more serious question is whether they did not err in taking the House of Commons for an elective assembly, and in imagining that the qualities in it which they approved and wished to reproduce depended on its elective character. Elective in theory the House of Commons no doubt was; but, in fact, only a very small part of it was at that period elective, while the larger part by far consisted either of actual nominees of the crown or the proprietors of rotten boroughs, of members for constituencies so close that the election was a farce, or of men who owed their seats to the fiat of great landowners, or to some local influence not of a popular kind. Of the 558 members, 90 were returned by 46 places, in none of which the number of voters exceeded 50; 37 were returned by 19 places, in none of which the number of voters exceeded 100; and 52 were returned by 26 places, in none of which the number of voters exceeded 200. The majority of the 558 members was elected by 15,000 voters, not the two hundredth part of the male adults in the kingdom. The owners of the nomination boroughs were generally, from interested motives, constant supporters of the government. The really elective element was no doubt influential out of proportion to its numbers because it was the only index of national feeling, as the intense interest attached to Westminster elections shows. But it was far from being the predominant or even the characteristic element of the House. As Erskine said: "The House of Commons from being a control upon the crown had become the greatest engine of its power." Of this there was proof enough in the affair of Wilkes, and afterwards in the quarrel with the American Colonists. Contested elections were comparatively rare. In 1780 there were contests in only three counties in the whole of England, and only in fifty-nine boroughs. In 1790, though the ferment created by the French Revolution had begun, there were only six contests in the counties and fifty-one in boroughs. It was urged also with truth by the opponents of parliamentary reform that of the leading men most had owed their entrance into the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House of Commons, not to election but to nomination. Lord Liverpool's Cabinet in 1818 consisted of fourteen members, eight of whom were peers. Of the six Commoners two sat for a treasury borough, one for a pocket-borough, and two for what were virtually nomination counties in Ireland; so that of a government supposed to be founded on the elective principle one member alone really owed his place to election.* Yet the House of Commons and the government, as dependent on its vote, were assumed by all the world to be elective, and imitation proceeded on that hypothesis. The elective element was taken to be not only the normal element, but the source of all that other nations admired as specially excellent in British institutions. The limitations of that element, such as the treasury, or nomination, boroughs and the influence of great landowners in county elections were taken to be corruptions and superfetations which had only to be removed in order to allow the elective principle to show forth its full beneficence, and make government entirely wise and the nations perfectly happy. But in face of the actual results we are constrained to ask ourselves whether it may not have been in part the limitations, equivocal as their character was, that made the institution workable. Alexander Hamilton, who from antecedents as well as temperament, had an advantage over the more enthusiastic children of the Revolution, was not without an inkling of the truth. He shrewdly suspected that what were called elective institutions in England were in fact made workable by those restrictions of the elective principle which were called corruption.

What a dance, if Hamilton was right, has the political world been led by its supposed imitation of British institutions! The world might be excused, since the British themselves did not know what their institutions really were, and, indeed, hardly know what they are at this hour.

Party government, many of the people who are not politicians are beginning to admit, is on its trial. But we must ask whether elective government is not on its trial also; or, rather, whether elective government, properly so-called, has ever in the case of nations or large constituencies really existed, or can be made really to exist?

GOLDWIN SMITH.

*See Jephson on "The Platform," I., 339.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHINESE QUESTION AGAIN.

BY THE HON. JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG.

THE *Congressional Record* of April 4 gives a complete report of the famous debate on the question of Chinese exclusion. It is worthy of study by those who would know how our rulers determine the gravest questions. Representative Geary, of California, almost immediately after prayers, called up the bill. The rules were suspended and "under the rule, fifteen minutes were allowed for debate." That is to say, fifteen minutes were all that the nation's representatives could give to one of the most important propositions of the time. Mr. Hooker, of Mississippi, made a plea for "two hours." Surely two hours would be little enough for what would practically be the determination of commercial and diplomatic relations between two great nations. The House was inexorable. There was a free-wool debate impending, and for wool hours and hours could be given, not one hour for China. Then Mr. Hooker craved "half an hour"; a half hour, at least, for a momentous issue. Mr. Blount, of Georgia, however, would have the "regular order." This, as the Speaker explained, was a "fatal objection" to the entreaty for a half hour, and fifteen minutes were all that could be conceded.

Then came the "debate!" The report covers three pages of the *Record*. This is not all that will appear on the subject, as we observe that Representative Hooker asked from the House "unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the *Record*." This was granted to the debaters, and, as the outcome, one may expect a pamphlet of essays called "speeches." A credulous constituency will accept them, and they will live in legislative history as the "debate on the Chinese question."

The "debate" was confined to five speeches of from "three to five minutes each," hurriedly panted out by the members, as we may well believe, under the Speaker's imminent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gavel. They were terse, nervous little addresses, and read as if they had been delivered with a bullet-like directness. Mr. Geary favored the exclusion of the Chinese "in the interest of American labor," and because China "lived in constant violation of the treaty." Mr. Hermann wanted "our gate-ways double-locked and barred" against "the degraded beings," while Mr. Cutting had read something from Bayard Taylor about the Chinese being "the most debased people on the face of the earth," "whose touch was pollution." Although the observations of Mr. Taylor, as I remember them, were written at a time when China was a sealed land and were based upon a trip through the unsavory quarters of the teeming port of Shanghai, still they had a value in the "debate." Mr. Hooker, speaking from the South, made a plea for the integrity of treaties, commending to our example the fidelity of China in that respect. Mr. Hitt, of Illinois, whose experience in diplomacy gave his words special authority, made an eloquent protest against "the savage exclusion and extreme punishment of all strangers" as a "revival of the darkest features of the darkest ages in the history of man." It was in vain! Fifteen minutes closed the "debate," and 222 representatives voted—179 for and 43 against the bill. There were no political lines in the voting. Bingham and Reyburn and Harmer voted with Cummings and Breckinridge and Timothy Campbell, and, as far as the House could speak, Chinese expulsion became a law.

Immigration should never be a burning question with China. I have always found the Chinese rulers indifferent to it. I recall but one conversation with Li Hung Chang, the Premier of China, during the time I was accredited to his government, in which the subject was even mentioned. And yet for a long time I was in constant intercourse with that distinguished statesman. This one allusion was made rather as a comment upon some action proposed by our government, and was in the nature of a question as to whether I could point out that special paragraph in "Wheaton's International Law" wherein it was provided that a Hottentot was more desirable as a resident than a Chinaman. My reply was that as the question was one in which His Excellency had no interest, it would be a waste of time to discuss it. The opinion I formed during my intercourse with Li Hung Chang was confirmed by a study of the causes which led to the fall of the American house of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Oliphant & Co., once a noted factor in the Eastern commercial world. The Oliphants were ruined by the British Governor of Hong Kong, who, at the request of the Chinese Viceroy at Canton, suppressed the cooley trade with Peru. The action of the Cantonese official, the merciless manner in which the Oliphants were pursued, even to their bankruptcy, form the one object-lesson which statesmen should consider, in endeavoring to understand the Chinese question. Whether the house of Oliphant would have been ruined by Sir John Pope Hennessy and the Canton Viceroy had it been an English and not an American establishment, I have never been quite able to determine.

While the Chinese authorities, and especially the Prime Minister, were indifferent to emigration, they were sensitive as to our manner of treating it. We have not really been severer than the English in India and the Imperial Colonies. We have never gone so far as to force opium on the people or to refuse to the Chinese government consular representation at our ports. But with our generous impulses towards the Chinese, we have managed by ignorance and indifference to drift into the appearance of injustice. The mind of China has in a sense been poisoned. Small things are magnified and idle debates distorted. Every hard phrase has been hurried to Peking, and with due garnishment and exaggeration spread before the rulers. We have few if any interests in China in common with Western powers. If anything, our interests are antagonistic, and there is a constant war upon them. With a liberal policy towards China I am persuaded that this war would have had barren consequences. But, to use the language of the sporting field, we seem to have ignored our true interests and to have been playing the hand of Russia and England. Such a transaction as the passage of the Scott Bill four years ago, and such a debate as this in the House on April 4 could have only the gravest consequence in Peking.

We might have expected such a debate from a Senate composed of Greeks of the lower Empire, but not in a free intrepid American assembly. Here were national and international interests of the gravest importance—interests which no legislature could usefully consider without the directing mind of the executive authority. I know of no government within the range of observation or study which would have allowed a question so important to flounder in the eddies of ignorant and partisan debate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet, so far as current events can be read, the administration permitted the debate to go by default. The question required careful inquiry and ample information as to present and prospective trade relations and special knowledge as to the development of our empire on the Pacific and our ultimate territorial rights in Australasia. There was likewise the nation's honor as affected by treaties. No debate, no statement of hypothetical cases, could throw light upon it. That light could alone come from the government. Without it, Congress has stumbled in darkness to dangerous and imperfect conclusions.

Nor can the administration be released from a certain responsibility for this unsatisfactory turn in the Chinese business. I say this with the utmost respect for the President, grateful as I am, in common with my countrymen, for a beneficent, conscientious, and able administration. When the President came into office, there were hopes that he would take up the question and deal with it to a wise result. These hopes were based upon his action as a Senator, when China was concerned, as well as upon those engaging traits of manly, independent action which have made him first among statesmen. I know that those high in authority in China looked upon his advent as a restoration of the relations between the two countries, which we owed to the genius of Mr. Burlingame. Nor shall I ever cease to regret that these hopes were doomed to disappointment.

What has been our policy towards China? To describe it roughly,—such a policy as we might observe towards the rulers of Madagascar or the African kings who reign in Stanley's Nyanza regions. I read the other day that an elaborate dispatch addressed to our government some months ago by the Chinese Minister had received no attention. It had, I presume, been put aside in the hurry of department work until living issues arising out of the hog trade or duties on sugar had been determined. We should probably treat a dispatch from a Congo sovereign in the same way. But while a neglected Congo sovereign could be soothed by a hamper of gaudy cloth or a casket of beads, the rulers of China are gifted, courteous, and punctilious. We know the history of the Abyssinian war, how a foolish letter from the Abyssinian King Theodore to the Queen was tossed into a pigeon-hole by some heedless Foreign Office subordinate, how royal anger flamed into evil deeds of retaliation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and how, before peace could be maintained, an English expedition costing millions was compelled to carry the heights of Magdala. I have no such fear in our relations with China. There will be no Chinese retaliation to invite military interference. It will come in a silent, effective way—in the atrophy of trade, the gradual diminishing of influence, the American lowering the flag which for a generation held the first place in China, the keen Englishman and the persistent German taking his place. This retaliation has already come in the refusal of Mr. Blair as a Minister, under circumstances which amounted to an affront, and which was probably so intended by the authorities in Peking.

Recent legislation can, in our charity, be deemed a consequence of ignorance and indifference. With the administration silent on Chinese affairs, how can legislators hope for useful knowledge? Congressmen represent feelings of local vexation, and look upon the Chinese question as a quarantine business, and imagine that we should deal with it as with yellow fever or leprosy. The vital features are ignored. Haste and prejudice and sloth pervade our discussions. We make treaties, but we do not enforce them. The Chinese are blamed for what is our own fault. We denounce the Chinese government for the immigration of Chinese, and overlook the fact that this immigration is from an English port and under the English flag, and that China has no more control over it than over the immigration of Irishmen from Londonderry. We interfere in the internal economy of China by abetting a Russian intrigue for the possession of Corea. When China makes a treaty under the pressure of a Presidential canvass, we inform her that unless within a few hours she ratifies certain amendments the action will be tantamount to rejection. We know that in this manner Bismarck treated Paris when under the German guns. We know that it is the tone of war, and not that of friendly diplomacy. Unhappily, unlike the Congo chiefs, hungry for cloths and beads, the astute rulers of China know it likewise, and resent it in their sure, silent, Oriental way.

Of that Corean incident little is known in the United States, and yet it is a potent cause of Chinese grievance. It was never other than a bit of diplomatic wantonness, the outcome of an eager naval officer's experiments in Oriental diplomacy. It will be understood more clearly when I say that China looked upon our negotiations with Corea for a kind of mock autonomy as we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should regard negotiations of England with the State of Maine for a Maine embassy in London and an English embassy in Augusta. If we have an understanding with Russia looking towards the progress of the Russian Empire in Asia, then Corea becomes an intelligible proposition. But of what value is such an understanding, except to satisfy some pitiful Jingo sentiment towards Great Britain? And for this questionable advantage we keep Peking, so far as our interests are concerned, in a state of irritation and suspicion. Corea is not and never has been our affair. Its recognition is a menace to Chinese self-respect and is ever a shadow upon our relations. China may say with truth and bitterness: "You claim to be a fair nation! Yet when the heavy hand falls upon us, America aids in striking the blow! You interfere with our suzerain rights over a province, and pilot the Russian into our dominions. You pay your own people four or five per cent. for money and ask China for ten or twelve per cent. You compel us to pay tael for tael for every loss to the missions from local disturbances—you tell the Chinese that you are not responsible for losses to our people. Your Congress may toss us indemnity as an act of grace, but you compel indemnity from us as a right. You make treaties which we gladly accept! Your people break them, and upon us you devolve the blame. You hold China responsible because Chinese laborers leave Hong Kong, forgetting that Hong Kong is as English as Cardiff or Melbourne. You compel us to surround your missions with troops, and yet in the United States the Chinese are abandoned to the mob. You eliminate from our treaties by act of Congress whatever is of advantage to our people—you carefully reserve whatever helps your own. The rights you deny us in America you enforce for Americans in China. You ask protection and hospitality. You give us fines, imprisonment, and deportation."

American policy towards China should be based upon the same lines as American policy towards England and France. Out of the fulness of our diplomacy what have we not done for the American hog in Paris and Vienna and Berlin? For that, praise now and always! But what might we not also have done for the American man in Peking and Tokio? These Eastern nations lean towards us, and would rest upon our strong arm. American genius under Perry opened Japan — American genius under Burlingame brought China into the diplomatic family of nations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where now is the power bequeathed to us by Perry and Burlingame? We are the neighbors of these empires. The richest markets in the world are nearer to us than were Liverpool or Queenstown twenty years ago. The development of our Pacific empire, now in its infancy, rests upon the commercial relations that should exist with Asia. This commercial empire of the East, if I may so call it, belongs to us by the ties of geography, enterprise and sympathy. We have no interests that jar with those of these vast and venerable empires. We do not menace their independence like Russia, nor seek the profits of shame like those reaped from the opium sin by England. Emigration or immigration in whatever form should be the merest accident. It could be arranged whenever we take it seriously in hand. There is no reason why American statesmanship should not direct the over-flowing tides of Chinese life towards Borneo, New Guinea and the Congo. There is every reason why we should be the ally and not the enemy of China. The youngest nation of the world could well give the hand of strength and courage and joyful, sincere endeavor to the oldest nation of the world, and assist her towards the solution of the gravest problem that ever taxed the wisdom of statesmen. It will never be done until we realize that the laws of justice are immutable even among nations—that strength can never come from wrong, and that issues reaching down into the very heart of our national honor and prosperity are not settled by a fifteen minutes brawl, called a "debate," in the House of Representatives.

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LONDON SOCIETY.

BY LADY JEUNE.

IT WOULD be very difficult exactly to point out when and where the change began which has been gradually transforming London society, but the death of the Prince Consort and the withdrawal of the Queen from public life marks a distinct epoch. The long mourning and seclusion of the Court was the commencement of the Queen's abdication of her position as head of society, and though from time to time she has appeared, it has been at too long intervals and in too fragmentary a manner to have any perceptible influence. During that period the social revolution has been advancing, and the few gatherings which the Queen honors by her presence and the guests invited to meet her, present in the most vivid manner the change that has come over society since she became a widow. No one is brought into personal contact with the Sovereign except those she knows or expresses a desire to see, but the gathering is cosmopolitan.

In a democratic country like England, the personnel of any Government, whether Whig or Tory, is largely composed of self-made men, who, with their families and belongings, gratify the keenest of English ambitions, that of getting into society, with a facility that was impossible fifty years ago, in the days before the passing of the Reform Bill. When the government was entirely in the hands of the two aristocratic parties, Whigs and Tories, society, political though it was, was essentially aristocratic and exclusive, the members of each ministry and their subordinates being men of birth, who belonged naturally to the society in which they moved; but with the extension of the franchise, the wealthy, well-educated middle classes took their share in the political arena, and, as the logical consequence, claimed their right to some of the social advantages of their leaders. Such social recognition was a prize highly valued and dearly bought, and the price of the much-coveted invitation often meant a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wavering vote. The wives of the leaders of political parties were very sparing and very cautious in their hospitality, and the fate of a government has often hung on the sending out of an invitation for an "At Home" at the house of the Prime Minister.

During the time that Lord Palmerston was in office, Lady Palmerston wielded a political power very little less potent than that of her husband, and an invitation to her Saturday parties at Cambridge House was as eagerly sought for as any political reward, and no one was a more efficient political aide-de-camp than she. She was a strong party woman, and never bestowed her hospitality outside the circle of her personal friends or on any save warm adherents or wavering opponents. She and Lady Derby divided the task of party entertainments, but with so many years of Whig ascendancy, to Lady Palmerston fell the lion's share of dispensing social favors—and the Tory leader's wife had a less arduous task. These reunions were exclusively political, and very rarely were outsiders admitted, while members of the medical profession, the bar, the stage, and even of literature itself, were seldom seen.

Lady Waldegrave was the first woman in a political position who opened her house to everyone, without distinction of party, and though she scandalized the more exclusive of her friends, she helped more than anyone to bring about the cosmopolitanism which is now the prevailing characteristic of English society. In her house everyone rubbed shoulders with his opposites. Tories and Whigs, Home-Rulers, doctors, barristers, actors and actresses—all found a welcome under her hospitable roof and in her warm and kindly sympathy. Since her death no one has taken her place, for party feeling has run so strongly that no one else probably could have accomplished anything like bringing the antagonistic elements of Gladstonian, Conservative and Liberal-Unionist society into harmony between four walls. With the disruption of the Liberal party and the desertion of its great Whig supporters, all society, in a political sense, in that party has ceased ; and the task of gathering together the fragments has been taken up in a very perfunctory manner by the wives of aspiring future politicians, leaving to the wife of the Prime Minister that of entertaining the House of Commons and their families, and we may fairly say that political society, as a distinct feature in England, for the moment, has passed away.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

London is so much larger and richer, the number of people who receive has so enormously increased, and the facilities for going into society are so very much more numerous, that the invitations to the house of a great party-leader are no longer sought after and intrigued for. The centre of society has, in fact, changed; a large portion of it remains where it always has been, and its members have opened fresh fields of enterprise for themselves. Literature, art, and science have advanced to positions new to them, and a small section, but a very important one, has formed a society of its own, all the more important because it has the acknowledged leader of society at its head—and is exercising an influence on English life and morals, the effects of which we can as yet hardly estimate.

The tendency of society in England is to grow large; indeed, to become unwieldy. London has become the centre of the civilized world, and everyone gravitates there; and as it is the fashion to know everyone and go everywhere, the struggle to accomplish this feat inevitably expands society. People have not the leisure to see their friends in a quiet, simple way as formerly, where real intellectual pleasure was always to be found in a certain number of small coteries which existed. Life is too full and too busy, and anyone with any pretence to social smartness finds his engagements so numerous that his only way of seeing acquaintances is by inviting them to the house, where, packed together in a hot room, much too small for half their number, a surging crowd of people comprised of the most opposite elements rub against each other, and try to find enjoyment in the fact that they are in a room with a large number of people more or less interesting and distinguished, none of whom they know by sight, and in whose existence they never interested themselves till it became the fashion to invite the lions and make them roar. To the hostess of the nineteenth century such hospitality is a pain and not a pleasure; for, assuming that she is a person of some appreciation of the great qualities of her guests, it cannot be aught to her but an annoyance that she is unable to give everyone of her friends the proper position and attention which he merits; but she has no alternative, for her large acquaintance and many engagements preclude her showing them hospitality in any other way.

The French salon has never found a counterpart in England. The inclination of the English as regards society is to eat, and not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to talk. An English man or woman's idea of hospitality and society is a dinner and a dress coat, and that in conjunction with as much formality and state as possible; and the simplicity of French society in this regard, which meant dropping in during a given evening one day a week to a well-known house where neither meat nor drink was provided, and where intellectual nourishment was the only food, never recommended itself to the English ways of life. It found some adherents in the days of Miss Berry, whose house in Wimpole Street was for many years the rendezvous of all the most distinguished people of her time. Lady William Russell, the mother of the late Duke of Bedford, one of the most accomplished women of the day, surrounded herself with a society as pleasant as it was small, and, to the last day of her life, was always to be found in the evening in her house in Audley Square. Lady Jersey, Lady Sandwich, Lady Granville, and Lady Ashburton were the only *grandes dames* who in English society ever tried to imitate the salon, and their *entourage* was very small. Their aristocratic prejudices were too strong to admit anyone outside the charmed circle, and many of the most distinguished men of their time lived and died unknown to them.

Whatever may be the reproach of the end of the nineteenth century, a want of appreciation of distinction in any form is not one. There never was an age where fame of any kind was more of a cult, or where notoriety was a surer passport to social eminence. Whether the greater intellectual qualities of mankind are recognized in proportion may be doubted, but society now runs mad after anyone who can get himself talked of, and that not in the sole direction of great ability or distinction. To have a good cook; to be the smartest-dressed woman; to give the most magnificent entertainments, where a fortune is spent on flowers and decorations; to be the last favored guest of royalty; or to have sailed as near to the wind of social disaster as is compatible with not being shipwrecked;—are a few of the features which characterize some of the smartest people in London society. It must be admitted that these qualifications are not high or difficult to attain to, while the training ground is large and well-studded with instructors.

Luxury, ease, comfort, are the watchwords of a large part of society in London, and they are undermining our society as surely and as certainly as they did that of ancient Rome. We have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grown very rich, and we have a large leisured class whose only aim and occupation is amusement, and where such exists it must demoralize and relax all social restraints.

Men and women who only live for pleasure, and who have no sense of the obligations of life and its duties, are becoming the parents of the young England around us, and to a serious degree the example of their lives is being impressed on the boys and girls who are their children, and who ought to carry on the traditions of which we in all time have been so proud. The influences of which we speak are perhaps less felt among boys than girls. School-life still develops the manhood and courage of Englishmen, and though the luxury of early preparatory schools is increasing to a very evil extent, the rough and tumble life of our public schools counteracts its influence, and gives all boys the knocking about which we still believe is so important for the development of the hardier qualities of a man's character. The battle of life—the struggle in all professions—is so keen that it brings out a man's strongest qualities, and the competition which he has to meet, and which is becoming harder every year, renders him more impervious to the enervating influences of the day. But society, as well as the tone of society, is not governed or instituted by men, their rôle in society being a very secondary one; for society in its tone and composition is created by women, and as women are virtuous or the reverse, so is their *entourage*.

It would be idle to deny that recent scandals in London society, which have been the talk of the world, and the existence of which surprised and shocked the moral sense of England, are only the outcome and logical result of the easy-going manner in which women of the highest rank and culture have allowed the old-fashioned rules and restraints which governed society to be relaxed. The decay of these restraints has been in many ways almost imperceptible, but the spirit of freedom and liberalism in every matter of life, whether social, political or religious, has impregnated every condition of life, and has gradually swept away the reserve and illusions of our forefathers.

Nowhere is this more conspicuous than among girls, whose lives are as different from those of their grandmothers as light from darkness. The respect for parents, the self-denial and self-abnegation, the modest reserve which used to be the character-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istic of the "English miss," have disappeared, and in her place we have a creature no doubt attractive and original, but not the girl of the past. Parents and children now meet nearly on an equality, but where there is any inferiority it is on the parental side. The young lady of to-day reads the newspapers, what books she chooses, and discusses with equal frankness the last scandal and the latest French mode; she rides in the park unattended by a groom, but always with a cavalier; she drives unattended in hansoms; she dances with partners who do not care to be presented to her mother, and she leaves her chaperon not to dance, with the real enjoyment of girlhood, but to retire to some leafy corner of the ball-room, where she can, to use the modern phrase, "sit out," instead of dancing. She spends her own money, and dresses as she likes, and more often than not spends more than she can afford. Her stay in London is one round of pleasure from morning to night, varied during the autumn and winter by country visits, which are only a repetition of London on a small scale; and in her life there is no question of aught but pleasure; and no more curious change is to be observed than that, while some years ago girls would go anywhere for a dance, now they only desire to go to the best balls and to be with the smartest people.

The reason for the change which has come over the English girls is no doubt to be found in the fact that for many years past they have not had, as far as regards society, a "good time." The young married woman has been as formidable a competitor to them as she is also said to be to another and an entirely different class of female society. Hence in dress, conduct, conversation, and often in knowledge, they copy their envied rival, or, by attaching themselves to some smart young married woman, they profit by what she squanders in the prodigality of her success.

However great the difficulties girls find in England in entering the social lists, they are much more hardly handicapped in the matter of dancing, and still more in that of marrying. Nothing is more comical, nay, even sad, than to see the devices to which ball-givers resort, to get men to come to their houses and when there to dance. Everything is done to tempt them. Balls begin at midnight, because the *jeunesse dorée* of England will not dance early; the *recherché* supper and the best of wines are provided;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and long before midnight patient rows of sleepy chaperons and anxious girls await the arrival of the young Adonis, who, after surveying the serried ranks scornfully through his eyeglass from the end of the ball-room, retires below to partake of the hospitality provided by his thoughtful host, and having thus done his duty goes back to his club. And what is true of dancing is even more so as regards marrying. Men who are poor are afraid to marry, knowing the life of ease and comfort which is the lot of most girls and that marriage will entail an amount of denial and self-sacrifice they are not willing to undertake. When great passion or affection are concerned, the case alters, and hand in hand a man and woman face the struggle together. But the nineteenth century has taken away much of the poetry and romance which gild the pathway of life when the gold is not of a sufficiently substantial kind to provide more than bread and butter.

Parents also feel naturally that when a man has no profession or prospects which will ultimately increase the income he can offer their daughter, that marriage would not only be unwise but wrong, and the effect is that girls marry later and, often, with a better prospect of happiness. But girls do not marry as easily or as well as formerly, and the confidant of fashionable London mothers will bear me out in saying that the universal cry is, "The men won't marry."

The increased expense of living and the difficulty that men with small incomes have in marrying, affect other classes in England; but in the middle and professional classes the improved education which women receive opens other careers to them besides the domestic one, and the choice of husbands is more varied and wider. It is the expense of living, and of living up to a certain position, that has driven so many of the daughters of the aristocracy to make marriages among men in business, and it is one of the principal causes of the democratization that is going on so rapidly in England. Money is the idol of to-day; without it life is ugly, hard, and wearisome; and if with it the romance and poetry of existence fly away, it helps to grease the wheels of the coach, and rubs and softens down many excrescences. It has been said, everything can be bought but health, and it is nearly true; wealth is a great power, either in its use or abuse; it is the keystone of success in the smartest London society, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no truer words were ever written than those of the Poet Laureate of our nineteenth century life:

> "Every door is barred with gold,
> And opens but with golden keys."

If we take up a society paper which chronicles the fashionable doings of the week, the list of the smartest and most magnificent entertainments are not those given by the *haute noblesse* of England, but by a host of people, many of whose names are foreign, and who thirty years ago would not have been heard of outside their provincial homes; and to their houses flock princes and princesses, and the acknowledged leaders of what was once, and that not long ago, the most exclusive society in Europe. The atmosphere heavy with the perfume of flowers; the spoils of the Riviera; the bewitching sounds of the voice of the last fashionable prima donna, brought there at a fabulous price; the delicacies of the supper room, and the banquet with its priceless wines—are the temptations which the crowd of magnificently dressed and beautiful women and blasé men cannot resist, and such is the nightly spectacle offered to any observer of what we term the "smart set" of London society. Shades of the former leaders of society and patronesses of Almacks, do you not turn in your graves at the sight of your grandchildren and their children associating on terms of intimacy and equality with a crowd whose sole recommendation is that it panders and ministers to the most demoralizing influence of an age already bad enough!

When all that is needed to insure an entrance into the highest society in England is unlimited wealth, where morality is unnecessary, and where it is patronized by the highest in the land—is it to be wondered at that the deterioration which is going on is much more complete, and will be more disastrous in its effects, than any one likes to admit. To those who feel seriously and deplore the effect that the recognition of the new elements which now compose society in England must have, the position becomes one of great difficulty. There is a great difference between an affectation of being shocked and a real manly protest at much that is going on around us. But neither is of any avail to stop a condition of things which, bad as it is, is condoned and accepted by those whose position and weight should make them raise up their voice in protest. This is an age of charity, and where there is no open scandal, no breaking of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new and most important addition to the moral law, "thou shalt not be found out," it is much more convenient to shut your eyes, and not incur the displeasure of the great ones of the world by crying in the wilderness.

The agricultural depression, and the necessity for retrenchment enforced on all the smaller landed proprietary, by obliging them to shut up their houses and live in a much reduced state, or to come to London, where in spite of its luxury it is easy to be poor, have destroyed a strong counteracting influence; and, like an engine over which its driver has lost control, society goes tearing wildly on unchecked in its career.

It must not, however, be supposed that there is no society in England save that which we have described, for there still exists a larger and more important one in many ways, where we find happy homes and families, and where the sense of duty and the responsibilities of life are the keystones on which their existence is built; where in a faithful way its members still discharge the responsibilities which great rank, birth, and vast possessions, entail, and whose existence is the backbone of English life. In some way there has never been a time in England when there was so strong a feeling of charity and of the obligations to their poor brethren which riches entail on their possessors, or when that charity was more nobly and generously bestowed. For their existence we are thankful, for they represent the power of resistance which alone can withstand the pressure of example and influence from the other strata of society.

It is not only from the widespread and general luxury, extravagance, and freedom, of the richer class of England that the evil which we deplore arises, though they are large and serious enough, but because the influence and example of the upper classes spread below and spread insensibly. How can we chide and condemn the vices of the poor in England when the example set them is what we see? Surely we must feel infinite pity for the poor outcast women of the world who sin because they must live, while there can be nothing but a feeling of horror for women who set their virtue so low as to make it the price of dresses which will "cut out" the toilettes of their women friends in society; nor can we have any but a feeling of contempt for the men who, marrying on small means, suddenly find their whole *entourage* changed by the addition of horses and carriages, French cooks,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and all the modern luxuries of a fashionable *ménage,* and who shut their eyes and accept the gifts of the fairy godfather who has wrought all these miracles. In all societies there are men and women low enough to accept these positions; but in England thirty years ago such a position would have been impossible, and no man or woman occupying it would have dared to appear in society. *Autres temps autres moeurs,* and with so many examples of the charity of the world and the complaisance of husbands, no wonder the "smartest set" in London society has created a condition of things that respectable English opinion considers a reproach and a danger to the country.

The decay of strong religious belief in some sections of English society is at last beginning to have effect in sweeping away some of the strongest restraints to which human nature can be subjected. We do not maintain that, in the great waves of passion which sweep across the lives of men and women, religion has always been an unfailing protector, but insensibly its influence controls actions and inclinations which would have been calamitous in their effect. Modern thought is changing the aspect of life and, with it, the relations of men and women, and that not in a repressive direction. The spread of education among women, and the emancipation which is its natural corollary, will work still greater changes, all in the direction we deplore; and unless some unforeseen event occurs which will change the direction in which society is moving, public opinion will insist on its reconstruction on a firmer and entirely different basis, and the lines of demarcation which now divide society will become more clearly defined. The "smart set" will follow its natural inclination, which has for its object the gratification of every pleasure and whim which are the fashions of the moment. The other, with certain ideals of duty, will, as now, endeavor to realize the responsibilities these impose, and, being composed of the strength and backbone of the country, will always be the power to adjust the baneful influence of its competitor. Fortunately for England the mass, and the most important mass, of opinion will be on the side of the latter; but, unfortunately, owing to the glamour shed over the former by the rank and position of its leaders, it will always be the smarter, and, therefore, the fashionable set.

M. JEUNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OLYMPIAN RELIGION.

II.—OUTLINE OF ITS PARTICULARS (Concluded).

BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE.

Passing on from the personal equipment of Homer's preternatural world, we have next to consider what were the distinctive qualities of its inhabitants as an order of deities.

The first answer must be that they were immensely varied; so varied, indeed, that they cannot receive any adequate description in a slight outline such as this. Their singularly differentiated characters require to be set forth one by one; and in their individual diversities we find one of the most important and fruitful provinces of the present inquiry. Still there are distinctive properties which the gods possess in common, and by which they are differenced from men.

The first of these qualities is that they are immortal. This is a property so essentially theirs that they are signified by it as a class. They, and they only, are the Immortals; and to name the Immortals is to speak of the gods. It appears, indeed, that the gift could be imparted to man. This is suggested in Tithonos, the partner of the couch of Eos;* and it seems in Homer to be an elementary part of the movement towards deification. If it be asked whether an Immortal could be deprived of the privilege, the answer seems to be, first, that, as a rule, penalty in no way interfered with immortality; and, secondly, we learn from the language of Arès† that, though the gods could not die, the heart of their life might possibly be beaten out of them by a penal infliction.

The next universal characteristic of the gods is, that they are incorporated in human form. Wherever this is at all doubtful,

* Il., XI., 1, and Od., V., 1. † Il., V., 885-887.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is because the image presented to us is so slight that it hovers between a person and a metaphor. The human form is presupposed even in the case of the Nature-powers; as when a wood-nymph has offspring by a man, or a river-god by a woman. So thorough and well rooted is this conception in the Poet's mind that, in a passage intended to glorify Agamemnon, he sets off, as we have seen, the personal appearance of the supreme chief by reference to the corporal excellences of various divinities; he was like Zeus in eye and head; his waist like Arès (the nimble god); his chest like Poseidon.*

The third common characteristic of deity as such is a large excess of power beyond any possessed by mortals. This power is exhibited in various forms: in superiority to limitation; in the performance of acts not within the scope of natural law; and, in the cases of a very few higher deities, by direct and immediate action on the mind of man. It is to be observed, as a general rule, that there is always a peculiar amount of power possessed in the peculiar province to which each divinity is attached. So it is that even Aphroditè can master the mind and inclination of Helen,† and that Hephaistos gives life to the metallic figures he has made, apparently even in the case where they are set upon the shield of Achilles.‡ But it is only to his greater gods that Homer assigns important prerogatives outside a particular sphere of action. Of this divine power the maximum must be said to reside in Zeus: yet he can be beguiled and deceived in being sent to sleep (as it appears, but the process is not described) against or without his will.§

But, fourthly, there is also by the side of this power an universal characteristic of limitation. This is indefinitely large and stringent in its application outside the provinces of specialty. So severe is it in the case of Aphroditè that, when she ventures upon the battle-field to carry off her smitten son Aincias, she is attacked by Diomed and wounded in the hand, so that she lets her burden fall, and repairs to Olympos with the aid of the chariot of Arès.‖ Thus in her case we are obliged to confine by conditions even the general proposition that the power of deities exceeds that of mortals. It holds, however, so generally that Achilles, whose might borders on the superhuman, is baffled and

* Il., II., 478, 479. † Il., III., 383, seqq. ‡ Il., XVIII., 535-540; 546-549. Od., VII., 91-94. § Il., XIV., 252, 262, 280, 359. ‖ Il., V., 318, 330-339, 363-367.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foiled by the Nature-power Scamandros when acting in his own right as a river-flood.*

At the other end of the scale, Zeus himself is not free from limitation in other cases besides the peculiar case of preternatural stratagem. He did not know, because he did not see, what Poseidon was doing on the battle-field in Troas; and he did not see, because he was looking in another direction, over the line of the Balkan mountains.† Again, after he woke, he accepted with a smile the assurance of Herè, confirmed by an oath, that she had not incited Poseidon against the Trojans. But he remained‡ unaware of the device by which she had contrived that the activity of Poseidon should be prolonged, through an exhortation which Hupnos delivered to him, apparently as her messenger.§ Aphroditè, Arès, Helios, and others make their complaints to him, and thereby show that he had not previous cognizance of the facts. I need not prolong the list of his limitations in this place. But it may be observed that they are limitations in the sphere of mind, not in that of external nature. The different deities of Homer stand differently related to locomotion; but there are no stages in the movements of Zeus as he passes from point to point. I have dwelt upon the case of Zeus, because, as he is at the summit, and as the Olympian system exhibits to us divinity in many conditions of inferiority to his, it will be readily understood that, as we move through the list of deities on a descending scale, limitation is progressively increased.

This proposition, however, has one most conspicuous exception. Although the mere power of Zeus is greater than that of Athenè, and is sometimes used in order even to coerce her, she, apart from these interferences, is exempt from all limiting conditions, whether material or mental. She is never ignorant, never deceived, never baffled. The case of Apollo closely, but less conspicuously, approximates to hers.

Fifthly, next to limitation, we must consider the case of actual wants. It cannot be said that the Olympian gods are wholly free from what we consider as corporal wants, for example, from what Aischulos calls the γάστρος ἀνάγκη. What can be truly said is that a large provision is made for the enjoyment which is

* Il., XXI., 263-274. † Il., XIII, 1-7. ‡ Il., XV., 42-47.
§ Il., XIV., 356.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

associated with the supply of wants, by the banquets which, though not uniformly in one place, are understood to be habitual with the gods. But, behind this curtain of luxury, something also of necessity remains. Not only Aphroditè and Arès, but Aidoneus, and even Herè, had at different junctures been wounded by the hand of man; and, though it is not recorded of the goddesses, the two gods* had to be cured of their wounds by Paieon. Again, as to food. Neither Athenè nor Apollo ever adverts to sacrifices as giving by their savor a physical satisfaction. But Zeus twice very unequivocally describes this reek of the victims, together with the libation, as the share or privilege of the gods;† the same words being put into his mouth on both occasions. Actual eating and drinking are, as we have seen, ascribed individually to deities less exalted. Calupso provides nectar and ambrosia for Hermes,‡ which he drank and ate to the satisfaction of his soul; and when Thetis visits Hephaistos, his bride and housewife Charis proposes to furnish *xeinia* forthwith, evidently meaning food. To this there is no parallel in the case of the higher gods. And, when Poseidon is on the field of battle before Troy, it is laid down that it is not allowed (*οὐ θέμις ἐστὶ*) to them to take part in the battles of men,§ although Arès, a deity of lower rank, had previously done it to his cost.

Zeus is the most human in his affections of all the gods, and sometimes regards with a strong natural compassion the sorrows of men, which at other times he is heartily delighted to behold;‖ but it cannot be said that other deities are as much given to emotion. The sympathies of Herè with particular persons, and especially with the Greeks at large, seem to dwell entirely in the region of the intellect, and in their operation are purely national and political. All the credit that can be given to the Olympian order, in the region of the affections, is that they are not devoid of sympathy with their own offspring. Aphroditè exerts herself for the relief of Aincias.¶ Arès is violently excited to revenge on learning the death of his son Ascalaphos;** and Poseidon repeatedly protects or rescues not his sons only but more remote descendants.†† All this, however, indicates much more of animal or instinctive, and perhaps of racial, than of

* Il., V., 401, 899. † Il., IV., 43; XXIV., 70. ‡ Od., V., 92. § Il., XIV., 386. ‖ Il., VIII., 51, 52. ¶ Il., V., 311, seqq. ** Il., XV., 113. †† *e. g.*, Il., XI., 750-752.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moral sentiment. For Poseidon betrays the quality of his paternal affection by bitterly persecuting Odysseus for measures of pure self-defence taken against the savage Polûphemos; the one monster of the Poems, whose passions and vices are unredeemed by a single virtue. Much higher in rank stand the affection and pain of Zeus on the extinction of his noble son Sarpedon.*

It would be improper to pass without particular notice the libertinism of the gods. They exhibit a prevailing laxity in sexual relations. On this topic it is to be observed, in the first place, that there is no such taint in the Homeric pictures of Athenè or (as I think) of Apollo; a fact which is only here noticed as a mark of Homer's profound reverence for those two divinities, without examining into its cause. Artemis also is wholly untainted; and, in the Hellenic image, is seemingly intended to be the representation of maiden and of matronly chastity. Passing from the exceptions to what is more nearly the rule, I deal here with the conspicuous case of Zeus in the fourteenth "Iliad."† He enumerates in series the human connections which produced respectively Peirithoos, Perseus, and Minos with his brother Rhadamanthos, Heracles, and Dionusos: the last of these undoubtedly divine, though from a human parent. He then passes to Demeter and Leto. And all these amatory affairs are paraded by the offender himself, at the meeting with Herè; a poetical impropriety which may be compared with the protracted speeches in the battle-field, or with the relation by Achilles to Thetis of a lengthened story in a great part of which she herself had borne a principal part. The impropriety is perhaps to be explained on similar grounds in all the cases: it seems to be a vehicle for imparting to the Poet's hearers what he desires that they should know with a view to the purposes, ethnographical or historical, which he had in his mind. We are, I think, to consider Zeus as describing in this passage, to an extent which in some degree we can trace, the formation of the Achaian nationality and religion. The connection with Danaè, for example, perhaps is meant to indicate the introduction of the Phœnician element into the Greek peninsula; that with Demeter, the reconciliation, so to call it, of the newer ideas with the old Nature-worship of the country; and that with Leto, the very special features which Apollo contributes to the Olympian scheme.

*Il., XVI., 459. † 315-328.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This view, I think, is supported by the case of Poseidon. There are assigned to him, in the two Poems, a number of important filiations in the Peloponnesos and in Scheriè, which obviously bear an ethnographical character; helping to attach, for example, the Phaiakes to the Phœnician connection, and Nestor to the same stock. It is possible that the Poet may have been governed by some similar consideration in assigning to Hermes and Arès respectively the paternity of some personages mentioned in the "Iliad." But, at the least, all these ascriptions have a moral aspect. Take them as we will, they clearly imply that there was nothing in Homer's conception of these several divinities to interpose a moral bar in the way of his imputing to them acts which in the case of men would carry with them more or less of stigma. I say more or less, for while in the "Iliad" spurious offspring is broadly distinguished from legitimate, the distinction does not always carry with it social consequences. In certain cases the innocent bearer of the stigma is admitted to equality in rearing.

Chastity may be called the outermost barrier of morality, and is the first, accordingly, to give way. The indulgence of sexual passion is general with the gods, unless there be a single exception in Apollo—a question requiring a separate discussion. It subsists among the goddesses also; and though not universally, yet most grossly of all in Aphroditè, who is simply its impersonation, and represents no other power whatever. Besides Aphroditè, we may notice the cases of Demeter and of Eos.*

Let us turn to a more general view of the quality of Olympian god-head.

Subject to certain reservations, which will be more properly considered in connection with the delineations of the Homeric deities individually, it must be confessed that their characters are self-centred and are based upon Hedonism, or the Epicurean system in its fullest development. They appear not to incur any responsibility; not to be subject to the moral law, which does not exist for them, because they have no superior, by whom its sanctions could be applied. They are exempted from its sway by the possession of exceptional power. The case of these imposing conceptions shows as if superiority in power, which ought always to be accompanied by a higher acknowledgement of duty, operated

* Od., V., 121-124; XV., 250—251.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a manner directly the reverse, and aggravated the derangement not only of human nature, but of every nature modelled, like that of the Olympian gods, on corresponding lines. True, we must distinguish between the pictures of deities still non-Hellenic, and therefore not entitled, in the Poet's eyes, to religious homage, and the representation of deities such as Herè, Poseidon, or Hermes. The first conception, which deals with non-Hellenic deity, amounts in certain respects almost to caricature. The second exhibits to us the genuine tendencies of a highly intellectual people in the process of moulding their religion; and they go far to prove that religion itself was on the road to become not a regenerating power, but rather, in important particulars, an instrument for aggravating the moral disorders of the world.

We have thus far treated of the qualities and powers of the Homeric gods in their several personalities. Let us now turn to consider more at large the general characteristics of the combination into which they were formed, and which I have named the Olympian religion.

When we come to contemplate this Olympian scheme as it is in itself, we cannot fail to be struck by the marked, systematic, and pervading character of its general characteristics, in which it so greatly differs from formations such as those of the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian religions. Let us enumerate some of these notes.

In the first place, the Olympian scheme of Homer is a highly scientific formation. Its numerous parts or ranks are placed in defined, and for the most part well-defined, relations to each other, and, notwithstanding their large range and diversified aspects, all are made to work together for a common end.

Without attempting here to define the degree in which the great undertaking of Homer partook of the elements of moral reform, thus much at least appears to be certain, and, if certain, peculiar. He first, and he only, in the history of ancient religions, brought order out of chaos, and unity out of diversities which might well have seemed irreconcilable. What were the materials with which he had to work? There was, first, the comparative purity which we seem justified in ascribing to the Achaian or Hellenic ideas. There was the Pelasgian cult of Nature-powers, a system little capable of lifting itself, or of being lifted, above the surface of the earth. Lastly, we have the more devel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oped forms of religion which had come over sea in Phœnician company, and which evidently drew after them a flood of moral corruptions. These offered to the Poet's eye an assemblage of materials anything rather than tractable. But, almost in despite of themselves, they were wrought into a poetical and literary unity. The task which he undertook and performed was one wholly without parallel in any other country. But it was essential to his nation-making work that he should constitute an Olympian unity, and without it the historic Hellas never could have existed.

In the next place, the scheme is highly national and political. Political, inasmuch as the divinities are members of an organization methodically ordered for a common purpose, so that in speaking of an Olympian hierarchy we speak, in the main, of an Olympian State. And it is national in more than one respect. In the first place, because its leading powers are charged with a strongly Achaian coloring. In the Trojan war the really great and powerful deities are all on the Achaian side, subject only to this qualification—that for a temporary purpose Zeus holds them back, and in so doing has in all cases Apollo for his obedient minister. The Olympian scheme, as Homer sets it forth, is variously national. Poseidon is attached to his Hellenized descendants; Herè is absolutely unremitting in her vigilance for the army at large, as well as for its leaders. It is the more special office of Athenè to keep watch and ward over the greatest of the national heroes personally; and Apollo, in the "Odyssey," presides over the crowning exploit of Odysseus. But it is also national in a still higher sense. The subject of the Iliad is not the war of Troy, but the wrath of Achilles exhibited during and in connection with the war of Troy. The plot results from an Olympian consultation, and is adjusted principally with a view to the glorification of Achilles; and it is in the figure of Achilles that we have the Poet's crowning exhibition of Hellenism. But though care and effort are concentrated upon this point, they are also distributed over the whole field of the nation. To every considerable chief there are awarded, in one part or another of the "Iliad," space and opportunity enough for a rich harvest of exploit and of fame; and even secondary personages, such as Meriones and Automedon, are not left wholly without their share of martial honor.

The Christian religion stands in contrast with the paganism which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it destroyed and replaced in this, among other particulars, that its main business has been the government of individuals and not that of states, although the government of states is doubtless a portion of its work, and ought to be directed in all things by its principles.

The Olympian system, on the other hand, as it stands in Homer, is more concerned with public affairs than with private character. Of private rights, indeed, it may have taken some cognizance, and when Odysseus recites the means of repairing his wasted fortunes, and among them contemplates the acquisition of much booty,* it is probable, though there is nothing distinctly specified, that this booty is to be prize of war. But the religion is very slightly charged with the formation of private character, beyond this, that the good man is devout and regular in the worship of the gods, like Eumaios in the "Odyssey";† and that misconduct cannot be covered by the mere tribute of sacrifice.‡ But the inner schooling of the individual, the expression of religion in devout affection, or in the control of appetite, or as a renewing process which is to cover the whole field of human nature, is unknown to this Olympian scheme; and piety hardly counts, though justice may, in the prospect or retrospect of life. It is predicted that Odysseus shall live and die in a happy old age, with his people prospering around him;§ but there is in this remarkable prophecy no reference to his relations with the gods. We hear of them in certain forms of duty; they are the guardians of nature's fundamental laws; and they are sought out in great emergencies; but beyond this they have no concern with human life in the private sphere. Indeed, in some cases, they are charged with its offences and miscarriages. On the other hand, they care for the general tranquillity, and resent the infraction of public right.

Whatever be the relaxations in the moral code of the divinities,—and they are undeniable,—their general government of the world not only "makes for righteousness" on the whole, but is directly and systematically addressed to the great end of rendering it triumphant. And this is claimed by Zeus in the Olympian Assembly.‖ The terms which he employs are remarkable: "Men complain of us the gods, and say that we are the source from whence ills (κάκα) proceed, but they likewise themselves suffer woes outside the course of destiny (ὑπέρμορον), through their

* Od., XXIII., 357. † Od., XIV., 435, 446. ‡ Il., I., 93, seqq. § Od., XI., 136; XXIII., 284. ‖ Od., I., 32-34.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own perverse offending" This offending is indicated by the term ἀτασθαλίη, used by Homer to designate the kind of wrong-doing which is the result, not of temptation working upon us through passion or infirmity (these are described as ἄτα), but which is spontaneous, wilful, and unrestrained by regard to God or man. The word comes near to the full idea of sin; and is deeper and more expressive, in regard to the moral law, than any phrase, so far as I know, to be found in the literature of historic Greece. Then Zeus goes on to illustrate by example what he has said: "for Aigisthos has committed his great crimes in spite of the express warning which we sent him from the gods through Hermes; but these outrages of his shall be punished by the hand of Orestes, when he comes to his full age."

And this claim of Zeus is a fair one. For nothing can be clearer than that each of the two Poems is constructed and adjusted with a view, in the main, to the triumph of right and the punishment of wrong. Troy is to fall, notwithstanding the strong personal attachment which Zeus felt for it on account of the liberal sacrificial system by which his altar profited; and the design of this retribution is the design which Zeus has either devised or at least accepted. On the other hand, not only do the troubles of Odysseus end in his restoration, but his return is gilded with the prophecy of a prosperous old age.*

Beyond this, there is very little to be said in abatement of the general proposition that, whatever be their collective conduct, the common speech of the gods is below the human level in point of morality. A debate in Olympos is far inferior in tone to a debate in the Achaian Assembly. The superlative quality of nobleness is to be found in the speeches and conduct of heroes. The speech of Sarpedon to Glaukos,† the rebuke of Odysseus to Eurualos in Scherië,‡ can hardly be surpassed. We look in vain for such discourses among the gods. The Olympian council of the last Book meets to perform an act of humanity in the conservation and redemption of the body of Hector. The thing done is right; but the whole process is made to turn on procuring the acceptance of the gifts of Priam by Achilles; undoubtedly a good working method, but one not uplifted by any sentiment more lofty than the expression by Zeus of the love which the gods entertained for Hector by reason of his constant offerings.

* Od., XI., 134-137; XXIII., 281-284. † Il., XII., 310. ‡ Od., VIII., 166.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nor is it easy to conceive a worse transaction than that of the fourth Book where it is arranged between Zeus, Herè, and Athenè that Pandaros shall be incited to break the truce so solemnly made for the settlement of the whole quarrel by single combat. On the suggestion of Herè, this mission is enjoined by Zeus upon Athenè; but it was a command that Athenè herself was eager to receive.* She at once rushed away to fulfil it, assuming a human personality for the purpose.† Without doubt it was necessary for the plot as decreed by Zeus on the prayer of Thetis that the truce should be broken. I think it is also true that Zeus does not act upon the minds of men in specific instances without some intermediate agency or manifestation, as Athenè acts upon the minds of the Suitors. Still it is singular and highly significant that Homer should thus employ the direct agency of the highest among his deities to secure the perpetration of what is among the very grossest of all moral offences, to wit, the deliberate breach of a most solemn engagement.

With this case before us, we cannot be surprised that Athenè, in the "Odyssey," should boast to Odysseus of her skill in guile,‡ and pay him the compliment of saying that he is her counterpart on earth. Yet more striking, from some points of view, is the case of Autolukos in the "Odyssey," who was instructed in the arts of fraud by Hermes himself; § an incident appertaining in great measure to the peculiar attributes of that divinity.

The third and the most remarkable among the characteristics of the Olympian religion is that which has been more commonly than happily termed anthropomorphism. The phrase is misleading, because it signifies no more than that the Homeric divinities are associated with the human form. But there is a far wider and deeper incorporation than this of the human with the divine element, which I venture to express by a term which, at any rate, is capable of conveying it in its full breadth—the term theanthropy. It is not the form only, but the mind, the character, the appetites, the modes of thought and speech, and both of acting and of suffering, which, subject to a reservation that is presently to be made, are pervadingly and intensely human. Nor is this humanism in the divinities confined to the individual: it marks the polity as a whole, not less than the single member of it; and the government of the world by the Olympian

* Il., IV., 64-73. † Ibid, 36-38. ‡ Od., XIII., 295-301. § Od., XIX., 396.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gods, with circumstantial differences, is essentially modelled upon the basis of human action. This theanthropic spirit is, more than any other particular, the *natura naturans* of the Olympian scheme. But besides the exhibition of theanthropic conditions in affirmative forms, we observe the determined theanthropism of the Poet in a multitude of arrangements, by which he throws into the background those forms of religion which are not in harmony with the spirit of the Olympian scheme, or contrives some compromise with them under which they are tolerated, but not allowed to retain an inconvenient form. It is not possible to go through, in this place, the mass of details from which alone these assertions can be made good. But by way of sample I will specify a very few of them.

The solar attributes of Apollo, derived from a nature-cult, are permitted to survive in decorative epithets, but so as nowhere to disguise his Olympian character or embarrass his action. Helios, the solar deity, possibly the working chief of Troic religion, is thrust almost, though not altogether, out of view in the "Iliad"; probably because he could not be exhibited on the same stage as the Olympian Apollo without confusion. But in the Outer geography of the "Odyssey" his full figure is shown, because on foreign ground he is not in competition with the Achaian and Olympian conception. The exquisitely beautiful Artemis of the "Odyssey" has a far inferior reflection in the "Iliad," evidently because she was associated in Troas with the system of earth-worship. Again, considering what we know of the widely-diffused practice of serpent-worship, we might be surprised at not finding it in the Poems. Animal-worship, however, in any form was obviously in deadly hostility to theanthropy. Therefore the serpent is carefully shut out from receiving homage; yet subject to this accommodation, that it keeps its place as a vehicle of presage, and that a position of great dignity is allowed to it, not, however, as a power, but as an emblem, on the breastplate and belt of Agamemnon.*

In all these characteristic points, the Olympian scheme is widely different from every other religion of the ancient heathen world. Nor is the record of distinctions yet exhausted. It has, as compared with any other among those religions, less in its aggregate of an abstract or didactic, and more of a

* Il., XI., 26, 33.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

literary, as well as a patriotic, character. I do not say that it represents more accurately the beliefs of the people among whom it sprang into existence than may be the case with some of the rest. Possibly, nay probably, it offers a less faithful picture. We do not here find ourselves in contact with a philosopher like Confucius or Zoroaster, or a reformer like Buddha. The motley group of gods to whom we are introduced do not, like the systems of Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, convey to us an undigested and almost chaotic record of popular worships. Those are disjointed stones; these are an elaborate and magnificent structure. Those are raw material in its earliest stage; these are coördinated, and in coördination modified, by the hand of a master. A great and commanding genius takes in hand a reconciling work. What sovereigns have during these later centuries sometimes attempted in combining by compromise the varying beliefs of their people, was in this case endeavored, and in great measure achieved, by a Poet. It is no wonder if, in such a case, we can trace the mark of the chisel upon the marble, and even find ourselves admitted to a shadowy view of the great artificer in his workshop.

W. E. GLADSTONE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

MEXICAN TRADE.

THE Statistical Bureau of the Treasury Department of Mexico has just issued a statistical abstract of the exports from that country for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891. It appears therefrom that the United States are fast absorbing the Mexican trade. The total exports for that year amounted to $63,276,395.34, and the share therein of this country was $44,983,086.37, or 71.09 per cent. of the whole. Next comes England, whose share of Mexican products is valued at $10,882,728.33, or 17.20 per cent.; in the third place is France, with the sum of $3,653,551.33, or 5.77 per cent.; in the fourth place comes Germany, with $2,785,874.86, or 4.40 per cent., and Spain, with $515,193.74, or 0.81 per cent.; then Holland, Russia, and Italy, the three with only $192,851.65, or 0.30 per cent.; and finally Guatemala, Colombia, Nicaragua, Salvador, and China, all with $262,264.06, or 0.43 per cent.

Notwithstanding the restrictive measures recently adopted in the United States against the importation of Mexican lead ores and live animals, the increase of trade with Mexico has been steady since the building of railroads which connect both countries, as is shown by the following table:

MEXICAN EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES DURING THE LAST SIX YEARS.

1885-86.	1886-87.	1887-88.	1888-89.	1889-90.	1890-91.
$25,429,594.56	$21,728,714.79	$31,059,626.66	$40,853,362.74	$43,022,440.67	$44,983,086.37
58.26 per ct.	56.37	63.54	67.91	68.84	71.09

The export trade with the leading European commercial nations during the last six fiscal years is as follows:

	1885-86.	1886-87.	1887-88.	1888-89.	1889-90.	1890-91.
England	$11,600,067.74	$13,362,186.57	$10,540,965.23	$12,535,534.99	$13,722,122.52	$10,882,728.33
	26.57 per ct.	27.17	21.56	20.84	21.96	17.20
France..	3,936,276.78	5,112,521.14	4,474,723.31	3,496,038.33	3,159,259.50	3,653,551.33
	9.01 per ct.	10.39	9.15	5.81	5.05	5.77
Germany.	1,571,399.20	2,175,770.11	2,177,106.09	2,061,563.09	1,693,773.15	2,785,874.86
	3.60 per ct.	4.42	4.45	3.43	2.71	4.40
Spain...	913,523.78	625,293.84	457,842.02	659,3,30.96	534,057.27	515,193.74
	2.09 per ct.	1.27	0.94	1.10	0.85	0.81

Of the total exports for the fiscal year 1890-91, $36,256,372.16 were in precious metals and $27,020,023.13 in other commodities. The United States received of the former $23,400,832.94, which is equivalent to 64.54 per cent., and of the latter $21,582,253.43, or 79.88 per cent.

The articles exported from Mexico during the last year were as follows:

Precious metals	$36,256,372.16	Lead	$1,125,468.64
Henequen	7,048,556.76	Tobacco	1,105,446.73
Coffee	6,150,358.72	Other articles	8,058,836.56
Hides and skins	1,804,828.69		
Sundry woods	1,726,527.08	Total	$63,276,395.34

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The preceding tables show that while the Mexican export trade with the leading commercial nations of Europe remains, in some cases, stationary, in others increases in a small degree, and in some diminishes, that trade with the United States marks a very rapid and decided growth, due, specially, no doubt, to the contiguity of territory, and the different nature of the products of each. I think it very likely that the participation of the United States in the Mexican commerce will grow larger every year in proportion to the development of the country, and keep pace with the results shown during the last year, unless it be checked by restrictive legislation on the part of either government, which I hope will not be the case.

Referring to the export trade of the United States with Mexico, I am sure that a similar increase will substantially appear during the fiscal year of 1890 to 1891. The last published report of the Statistical Bureau of Mexico corresponds to the year ending June 30, 1889, and shows a discrepancy with that of the Treasury Department of the United States for the same year, arising from the fact that in the latter only such articles as go to Mexico by sea are considered, no notice being taken of those going by rail over the border, and most of the commodities imported into Mexico from the United States go now through the frontier, transported by the railways which connect the two countries. In the United States Statistical report for that year, for instance, the total imports into Mexico, amount to $11,486,896, while in the Mexican report they foot up to $22,669,421. The former bureau fixes the exports to Mexico for the last fiscal year (1890–1891) at $14,969,620, but I am sure this amount is hardly one half of the real exports, as the exports by rail are not considered at all. In comparing the exports and imports of this country to and from Mexico, the fact must not be overlooked that the exports from Mexico are given in the Mexican report in Mexican silver, while the imports from this country into Mexico are stated in United States money, or gold, and the difference between these metals is now at about 35 to 40% in favor of gold.

The Statistical Bureau of the Treasury Department of the United States has always acknowledged these facts and earnestly tried, although so far unsuccessfully, to mend them. The Chief of that Bureau in his annual report on the foreign commerce of the United States for the year ending June 30, 1891, says (page 13):

"6. The statistics of exports of domestic commodities to Mexico and to Canada by land are defective, owing to the fact that there is no law requiring railway companies to furnish to collectors of customs statistics of domestic merchandise transported over their roads to these foreign countries."

The same official says in a foot note (page 111) in his quarterly report of the imports and exports of the United States for the three months ending September 30, 1891:

"In the absence of law providing for the collection of statistics of exports to adjacent foreign territory, over railways, the values of exports to Mexico are considerably understated. The official Mexican statistics state the value of the imports of merchandise from the United States in 1888 as $19,226,311, and for 1889 as $22,632,693. Statistics of their imports for later years have not been received. Substituting for our imperfect exports the imports from the United States as reported by the Mexican Government, it will appear that the value of our exports to Mexico about equals the value of our imports from that country."

M. ROMERO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF ALASKA.

A QUARTER of a century has elapsed since the treaty was signed which transferred the possessions of Russia on the American Continent to the United States. In other parts of the Union the same twenty-five years have witnessed the birth of territories and their development into states, but Alaska is still in an undefined and experimental stage of its existence—an outlying province, a territory without autonomy or representation, a district with a Governor who does not govern. As a business transaction the purchase of Alaska was a great success, but as a political innovation and experiment its acquisition has not thus far produced any gratifying results.

Secretary Seward and Senator Sumner, the advocates and promoters of the Alaska purchase, have often been praised and extolled for their far-seeing policy in pushing the measure, but whether they saw far enough may well be questioned. At the time of the negotiations between the United States and Russia for the sale of the latter's province, which England had refused to buy, British Columbia was a poverty stricken and neglected colony—the Cinderella among Great Britain's outposts. The fur trade was still in the hands of the Hudson Bay monopoly; the few inhabitants were dissatisfied; the trade of its only seaport, Victoria, was largely in the hands of Americans. Overland railways were still a dream of the future, and communication with the mother country was kept up by annual sailing vessels.

There was an opportunity for far-seeing statesmen. The acquisition of that strip of coast, which would have made United States territory continuous, could and should have been accomplished then, even if the price had been five times that of Alaska. Had the step been taken we should now command the North Pacific beyond dispute, and beyond all possibility of complications such as have now befallen us. There would have been no Behring Sea trouble, no boundary question to stir up strife among kindred nations.

So much for the "might-have-been"; let us now consider what *is*. England's statesmen have long since recognized the possibilities hidden beneath the shabby plumage of their ugly duckling on the North Pacific, and to-day she rejoices in the possession of a transcontinental road over her own soil; by which she can send troops in transit to any part of Asia, and at the end of it she has a flourishing province, rich in fish and timber, a strongly fortified naval depot, and two growing cities with magnificent steamships plying to the Orient. And all this lies in the very path to our outlying province—cut-off, isolated Alaska. Our mail steamers, our surveying vessels, and other Government ships pass to and fro through British waters and through a British province which England will not relinquish under any circumstances now conceivable.

Turning from the birds in the bush to the one in our hand, the question arises, "What have we done with Alaska in these twenty-five years?"

At a comparatively insignificant expense to the Government we have learned more of Alaska's geography and topography, its people and its resources, in twenty-five years than Russia learned or tried to learn in one hundred and twenty-six years of possession. Our people have drawn more money and products out of the country than the Russian people did, and our Government has received more revenue from the country than the Czar's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treasury ever derived from the same source. (On the last named point we shall probably not be able to boast in the future, since England, on the strength of her position in British Columbia, is striving to prevent us from deriving any revenue hereafter.)

For the twenty years preceding the year 1860 the gross receipts of the Russian-American Company from all sources in Alaska were about $11,000,000, out of which dividends were paid amounting to $1,500,000, and $2,250,000 to the Imperial Government in the shape of import duties on Chinese teas purchased with Alaskan furs. During the twenty years, from 1870 to 1890, we drew from Alaska products of various kinds to the value of over $60,000,000, while the United States Government received a cash revenue of over $6,000,000.

We have inaugurated the industries of cod fishing, whaling, salmon canning, and gold mining, and to-day the native population, whose number the Russians never ascertained, but who have certainly not increased, consume in one year more flour and soap than they did in half a century under the Russian régime.

Russia left the people of Alaska to the iron rule of a trading monopoly invested with judicial powers, while the courts of appeal were so far away that they were out of reach of anybody but the all-powerful company. This company could flog the people or transport them at will, but could not settle the smallest account without reference to the home office, involving years of delay. We have given the people liberty of action and freedom of movement, and we have established at least one court of final resort in the country.

The Russian Company maintained schools only for training its own employees and their offspring, who were obliged to render not less than fifteen years' service in return. We have established free schools at all points where they are wanted, and in some places where they are not wanted. Instead of the dormant missions of the Russian Orthodox Church which dotted a narrow fringe of coast lands, we have now, in addition, the stations and schools of seven denominations scattered broadcast over Alaska.

Russia jealously barred out all visitors from her shores. We have opened the more accessible part of the country to thousands of tourists who view from the deck of palatial steamers the grandest scenery on the continent.

Russia, or, rather, the Russian-American Company, conducted costly explorations for minerals, and officially proclaimed that no precious metals existed in paying quantities. Our prospectors, unaided, have searched, and continue to search, every valley and gulch in Alaska, and, as a result of their labors and ventures, Alaska now boasts of the largest quartz mill in the world, and has become an exporter of bullion.

On the shores of the inside channels, which the Russians twenty-five years ago dared not navigate without an armed guard, shotted guns, and boarding nettings, we are met to-day by the busy hum of thriving mining towns, with sidewalked streets, enlivened by rumble of wheels and clatter of hoofs, with hotels and boarding-houses, large stores, steam laundries, saloons and churches, steam ferries puffing from shore to shore, the muffled roar of blasts and the glare of electric lights.

All these are changes we have wrought in twenty-five years, and which Russia failed to bring about in one hundred and twenty-six, which proves that for the brief time of American occupation we have made in Alaska a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commercial, industrial, and educational record, of which we may justly be proud, even though politically we have left the territory very much where it was, and have not brought it into any intimate relation with the mother (may we say step-mother?) country.

To a great extent this has been due to the difficulty of dealing with abnormal situations to which our common legislative and administrative methods do not apply. Mail service and all other functions of the Government in Alaska cause an expenditure out of all proportion to the service required and performed, and consequently Congress has been unwilling to provide the usual territorial machinery. In other parts of the Union the pioneers of new sections of the country have always taken themselves the first steps towards organization, camps have grown into towns, and townships into counties, but in Alaska the circumstances are entirely different. Its population now foots up 32,052, divided as follows:

Whites	4,294	Mongolians	2,287
Mixed (Russian and natives)	1,829	All others	112
Natives	23,530		
Total			32,052

Though in the summer the canning and whaling industries swell the number of white people in Alaska to four thousand, the resident American citizens do not number much over one-fourth that number, and even these are much scattered, affording but an unsatisfactory basis upon which to build even the most primitive political structure.

Upon the whole it would appear that until the country gives proof of further development, and until it shall have been decided whether any further revenue will flow from Alaska as an offset to expenditures, we have granted enough, and we can complacently face the question: "What have we done with Alaska in twenty-five years of possession?"

IVAN PETROFF.

CONTRACTS AND THE CURRENCY.

IN DISCUSSING the financial problem as affected by the silver coinage, the friends of an honest currency are too prone to overlook the fact that gold fluctuates in value, as well as silver. Debtors have been cheated with the rise of gold, and very sadly cheated, too, just as with silver coming to the front creditors will likewise be cheated. When silver was demonetized the creditors gained, and by the rise in gold values our national debt, while it was nominally being paid off at a tremendous rate, actually increased—measured as commodities, which is the true method of estimating it—from the time of the close of the war until well along into the eighties.

If stability of value is the quality that gives character to an "honest dollar," then a gold dollar cannot lay claim to the title any more than a silver one can. It is only somewhat less dishonest. Just now one robs Peter to pay Paul, and the other endeavors to rob Paul, at a somewhat heavier rate, to pay Peter. The silver men say in effect to the "sound money" men: You fixed the law once so that we had to pay you more than we owed you. We intend to fix it now so that we shall pay you less than we owe you.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a sorry game, that of cheating by law. All will suffer in the long run, both debtor and creditor. Ought there not to be enough fair-minded, honest-hearted men in Congress to agree upon some measure that should assure the equitable fulfilment of contracts? If not; if the American people are to be divided into two opposing factions on the question of the currency, each endeavoring to see which can get the advantage of the other in a "skin game," then the outlook does not seem very encouraging for the future of America.

Would not the desired end be secured by a simple enactment to the effect that, in the fulfilment of all contracts involving the payment of money, payment should be made of an amount representing the purchasing power of the sum agreed upon at the time the contract was made. The purchasing power would be determined by the market value of certain staples at a given date. To enable the easy and accurate computation of this, the Secretary of the Treasury might be instructed to have monthly lists of the prices of these staples prepared and posted in all public places throughout the country. It would thus be shown that, upon such a date, one dollar was good for so much corn, so much wheat, so much cotton, so much wool, so much pig iron, so much flour, so much coal, etc. By striking an average the abstract purchasing power of a dollar on the date in question would be shown. If in the next month's statement any fluctuations of a marked character should be manifest, and these were not counterbalanced by other fluctuations, then the dollar's abstract purchasing power would be represented by a different average.

For instance, if on June 6, 1891, Smithson agrees to pay Johnson $1,000 six months from date in return for merchandise bought of the latter, then under this rule the $1,000 to be paid on January 6, 1892, would mean a sum corresponding to the purchasing power of $1,000 six months before. If the purchasing power had diminished, then more than $1,000 would be required in payment; if it had increased, less than $1,000 would be needed.

For instance, if the purchasing power of a dollar were represented by 98 on June 6, and on January 6 it had increased to 102, then, a dollar being worth more, it would not take so many of them to pay the debt, and $960 would satisfy it, for it would purchase just as much value in goods as $1,000 did then.

In practice, of course, under ordinary circumstances the fluctuation would not be likely to be anywhere near so great as in the example given, for the changes in the values of so many staples would largely counteract each other, and the average that would represent the abstract purchasing power of the dollar would probably change but little in so short a space of time.

In the same way, stability in the value of wages would be secured by such a plan, for the workman would be paid an amount corresponding to the purchasing power of his wages at the time he was hired.

Under such a system it is conceivable that the standard of the currency might be lead, or pig iron, as well as gold or silver. However the currency might fluctuate, the standard for the payment of contracts would remain the same—the purchasing power of the sum agreed upon at the date of contract. Neither debtor nor creditor could then be cheated, and, with a stable standard of payment assured, there then would be no motive for maintaining an unstable currency.

SYLVESTER BAXTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAN WE HAVE CHEAP CABS?

IN THE sense in which the term applies to all the great cities of Europe, there is no cab system in this country.

London and Paris, the two greatest cities of Europe, will best illustrate the conditions under which a system of cheap cabs has been developed, and a brief review of the system, as it exists in those cities, discloses the only reasons why similar enterprises have not thriven in America.

In the city of London there are about twelve thousand licensed cabs, which earn an average of one pound each per day. The average fare for each trip is not more than two shillings, and it therefore follows that London cabs are used at least one hundred and twenty-five thousand times every day. In Paris the use of cabs is still more universal. In that city there are thirty thousand licensed public carriages, but, as many open carriages are used in summer, replacing closed cabs, laid up for the time being, not more than twenty thousand are in use at one time. Their average earnings amount to twenty-five francs a day, based on an average fare not exceeding two francs per trip. In order to yield this amount, the cabs must be used two hundred and fifty thousand times within twenty-four hours.

On the other hand, if New York is taken as an example in this country, a very different state of affairs is found to exist. The municipal records of New York show that there are in that city fifteen hundred public carriages of all classes. These include hansoms, cabs, coupés and carriages. The best estimate of their daily earnings is $7 per day for each vehicle, with an average fare of $1. These figures are based on the authorized charges, and are liberal; if the revenue derived exceeded this per diem amount, the profit from the business would tend to increase the number of conveyances offered for hire. It would appear, therefore, that the people of New York use carriages about ten thousand times every day. The purposes for which they are used, however, vary greatly in this country and abroad. In London the cab is used by almost every one who has occasion to move about the city,—the government official, the professional man or merchant and his clerk, his wife and daughters on their social or shopping tours, the tourists on their rounds among the various places of interest, and, in fact, every person whose object is to be transferred from point to point cheaply and expeditiously. One can hail a cab in nearly any part of the city at any time, and at a trifling expense be set down at any destination with a reasonable dispatch.

The Parisians go even further than this. The large number of cabs available, and the regular and low rates of fare, serve to make the use of them a part of the every-day life of the citizen of every class. The Paris cab is ubiquitous. There is a choice of them always at the beck and call of the pedestrian. They are engaged and used by every class and condition of people. Not only do the wealthier people and the middle classes call them into requisition for short as well as long trips, but the fare is so cheap, and the movement so prompt, that clerks and shop girls, mechanics and laborers, are numbered among their patrons. Washer-women with their baskets employ them, and they may frequently be seen laden with a family and their household goods in process of moving from flat to flat.

In New York, on the other hand, no such conditions are found. The number of public cabs which can be taken on a moment's notice is too small

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for consideration. They are to be procured only at a few specified stands, unless accidentally caught on the streets without a passenger, and they are not used habitually by any class of citizens, but exceptionally, and because an emergency makes it necessary. The large percentage of conveyances, with the exception of those plying between the railroad stations and steamship landings and the hotels, can only be secured from the livery-stables by telephone, and are only ordered for specific occasions. The vast difference in the use of public carriages in the United States and Europe is, however, easily accounted for by the physical and other conditions existing in American cities. It is well known that both London and Paris are excellently paved, and, therefore, the wear and tear on both horse and carriage is reduced to the minimum, while the maximum of comfort is secured to the passenger by the smoothness of the streets. This is demonstrated by the fact that the average amount required for repairs in London is $85 per annum for hansoms and $50 for four-wheelers, while the sum expended for the same purpose here amounts to $125 for hansoms and $75 for four-wheeled cabs. Abroad the cab horse will perform the service for five years; in this country his usefulness is ended in three. The streets of our American cities are noteworthy for their bad paving. Cobble-stones and Belgian blocks, intersected and bisected with car tracks, are the most serious obstructions to the successful maintenance of cheap cabs, and when to this is added the complete system of street railways, which every one of our prominent cities possesses, and the exorbitant charges exacted for cab service, the small use of public cabs is sufficiently accounted for.

Several attempts have been made to introduce so-called cheap cabs in our cities, but in every instance failure has resulted,—from the simple reason, in my opinion, that the rates of fare have not been made cheap enough. Our street-car system is comprehensive in each of the large cities, and affords a ready and cheap means of transit for the masses, with more or less rapidity of movement, yet street cars do not, and cannot, fill the place of cabs. Public convenience demands cheap cabs, and the movement in this direction is growing each year, but in order that they may prove remunerative, it is necessary that the charges shall be cheap enough to bring them into general use, and the number of cabs available large enough to lead the people to depend upon the service.

Most of the items of expense entering into the cost of providing cabs are as low in this country as in Europe, some of them lower. The cabs and harness can be had as cheaply, horses cost less, provender is cheaper, and the only advantages which the foreign cab-owner possesses are the lower wages and the reduced expenses for wear and tear by reason of better pavements.

The best proof that a cheap cab system will be supported, provided the rates are low, is shown by the experiment made in Philadelphia. In 1882 the Pennsylvania Railroad Company placed in service in that city forty hansoms and ten four-wheeled one-horse cabs, charging for hansoms about the same rates that prevail in London, *i. e.*, for hansoms, 25 cents for a mile and a half for one or more passengers, and 15 cents for each additional mile, or, if hired by the hour, 65 cents. For four-wheelers a somewhat higher tariff was fixed, viz., 40 cents for a mile and a half for one or two persons, and 10 cents for each additional passenger, or, if hired by the hour, 75 cents for one or more persons. After the London custom these cabs are hired to the drivers at a certain sum per day, varying, according to the season, from $3.50 to $4.50 for the use of a cab and two horses. They are constantly in service, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

venture has paid a good return on the investment. In the meantime the original plant has been increased, and the present equipment consists of 50 hansoms, 25 four-wheelers and 3 victorias, with 128 horses in the stables.

This experiment, it is true, is on a small scale, but it has demonstrated beyond a doubt that moderate charges will popularize cabs, and that they will pay as an investment. This result is accomplished in the face of the fact that Philadelphia is the most unfavorable city in the country for such an experiment, since it has the worst-paved streets and a system of street-cars so complete as to include every important street in its service.

In view of the reasons given for their success abroad and their failure here, the question of maintaining a profitable system of cheap cabs in New York and other large cities hardly admits of a doubt, provided that the principles which underlie the foreign system be applied as far as changed conditions will admit. The fixing of fares that will place them within the means of persons in every condition of life is paramount to all other considerations. The rates so fixed must be adhered to, so that a person may engage a cab with the same confidence that the public charge will be exacted, and no more, that he would feel on entering a street-car. In order to accomplish the result, the enterprise must be upon a scale sufficiently large to make the cabs common and to give to the public the assurance that they may depend upon them when needed. If these conditions are fully met, despite the apparent competition of street-cars and the disadvantages of inferior pavements, I can see no good reason why such an undertaking should not be successful.

As it would probably be difficult to raise the amount of capital required for trying the experiment on so large a scale as would be requisite to provide a complete system for a city like New York, a beginning might be made in the manner that has proven so successful in Philadelphia. A well-regulated service of cheap cabs at the railway stations and ferry landings would undoubtedly meet with as much favor and yield as fair a revenue in New York as a similar institution now in prosperous existence in its less populous neighbor. This would be but the entering wedge to a system that would eventually serve the entire city.

A. J. CASSATT.

GROWTH OF CITIES.

THE growth in urban population and wealth is one of the most marked and interesting of the social phenomena of the time. In each particular, and in every great state in Christendom, with the single exception of Russia, the expansion in the towns is much greater than in the rural communities. We see little of this tendency of things in Russia, because that country has not yet reached the stage of social and industrial development which brings it about, and which is present in a greater or less degree in all the nations of Central and Western Europe, and in the United States. France, which grows only to a trifling extent in inhabitants in the country, as a whole, grows rapidly and continuously in its business centres. Outside of the cities its population is steadily shrinking, and has been for years past. In Great Britain and Germany the aggregate increase is more marked than in France, as well as more widely diffused, but outside of the towns it is not at all striking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or important. The same is true of Austria, though in a smaller degree.

The drift of population and wealth to the cities finds its most conspicuous manifestation, however, in the United States. Here, too, the data which reveal it, and by which it can be measured, are most abundant and accessible. The following figures show the percentage of increase in inhabitants in the twenty-six leading cities of the country between 1830 and 1890, and in the States in which these cities are situated, as well as the per capita amount of the assesed value of real and personal property which they contained in each of these years. The figures of population are from census bulletins. Those which relate to wealth have been kindly furnished me by the officials of the Census Office, and have not hitherto been made public :

	Percentage of Growth in Population.		Assessed Values of Property in Cities, Per Capita.	
	In the City.	In the State.	In 1880.	In 1890.
New York	25.62	18.00	$906.96	$1,119.90
Chicago	118.58	24.32	234.45	199.44
Philadelphia	23.58	22.77	686.67	1,022.36
Brooklyn	42.30	18.00	411.04	561.50
St. Louis	28.89	23.56	471.55	544.37
Boston	23.60	25.57	1,762.39	1,832.96
Baltimore	30.73	11.49	734.38	640.48
San Francisco	27.80	39.72	1,044.96	1,043.70
Cincinnati	16.37	14.83	663.58	598.75
Cleveland	63.20	14.83	440.52	381.15
Buffalo	64.80	18.00	540.89	635.05
New Orleans	12.01	19.01	424.80	545.02
Pittsburg	52.58	22.77	599.33	863.31
Washington, D C	29.71	.....	508.95	665.42
Detroit	76.96	27.92	715.13	786.05
Milwaukee	76.90	28.23	483.41	515.90
Newark, N. J	33.20	27.74	610.69	626 93
Minneapolis	251.35	66.74	499.41	831.29
Jersey City	35.02	27.74	483.86	484.39
Louisville	30.20	12.73	531.76	504.61
Omaha	360.23	134.06	246.17	142.62
Rochester	49.83	18.00	471.33	746.47
St. Paul	221.07	66.74	578.69	917.84
Kansas City	137.91	25.56	189.61	621.52
Providence	26.02	24.94	1,102.28	1,064.10
Denver	199.51	112.12	454.52	624.34

It will be noticed that in nearly every instance the city here presented has grown faster in population than its State. But the showing can be made much more favorable to the cities. Only the larger or representative ones are given here. If all those of 8,000 inhabitants and upwards were cited it would be seen that the rural element is being distanced rapidly in the race. Out of every 100 of the aggregate population 3.35 people were in towns of 8,000 inhabitants and upwards in 1790, 4.93 in 1810, 6.72 in 1830, 12.49 in 1850, 16.13 in 1860, 20.93 in 1870, 22.57 in 1880, and 29.12 in 1890. In 1790 there were 6 cities in the country which touched and passed the 8,000 mark; there were 286 in 1880, and 443 in 1890. A hundred years ago a little more than 1 in every 30 of the aggregate inhabitants of the country resided in towns of the limit indicated, while now the towns contain almost 1 in every 3. There were but 14 cities in the country in 1870 of over 100,000 in population; there were 20 in 1880, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

28 in 1890. In 1880 there was only one town (New York) in excess of 1,000,000 in population; in 1890 there were three—New York, Chicago and Philadelphia. The drift citywards, which was tolerably uniform in volume in the decades from the beginning of the Government onward to 1880, has been unusually large in the past ten years.

As the valuation of property given here is that shown by the assessors' books, the figures do not in all cases reveal the relative standing of the cities in point of wealth, the basis on which taxes are levied not being the same in all cities. On the whole, however, the figures present, with a tolerable degree of accuracy, the standing of each town in 1880 and 1890 in this respect. The apparent falling off in the per capita wealth which is shown in a few of the towns named is undoubtedly due, to some extent at least in the case of Chicago and of Baltimore, to the absorption, within the decade, of outlying districts in which the holdings of property were not so great as in the parent towns. Property, in the aggregate, expanded in assessed value, in round figures, $101,000,000 in Chicago, and $34,000,000 in Baltimore, in the ten years; but this growth, for the reason named, perhaps, did not keep pace with that of population. Louisville's seeming per capita shrinkage, as I am informed by a fiscal official of that town, is due to a change in the basis of taxation since 1880. One or other of these causes will probably be found to hold good as to the two or three other cities in the list in which the proportionate wealth was apparently smaller in 1890 than in 1880. The true value of the property of the country has not yet been fully ascertained by the census officials, but they estimate that it is about $1,000 for each man, woman, and child of the population. It amounted to $780 in 1870, and to $870 in 1880. We know that by far the greater part of this expansion in wealth has been made in the cities.

But this exhibit still fails to do entire justice to the cities, and for these reasons :

1. The assessed valuation of all property, as shown by census figures for thirty or forty years past, bears a steadily decreasing ratio to the actual value.

2. It is a notorious fact that personal property, to a steadily and rapidly increasing degree, eludes the vigilance of the assessor. Obviously these circumstances, especially the latter fact, have a much more marked effect on values in cities than in thinly-settled districts. We know this to be true, because the census report of 1880 showed that, while the cities of 7,500 population and upwards held only 22 per cent. of the country's population in 1880, they contained 40 per cent. of its personal property, and because in the ten years ending in 1880, while, as shown by the assessors' books, real estate throughout the country augmented about 31 per cent., personal property shrunk about 10 per cent. Of course, every person who is qualified to speak with intelligence on these subjects is convinced that personal property, instead of decreasing in those ten years, must have increased in value in a much higher ratio than real estate. The census figures for 1890 on this point have not been given to the public at the present writing.

As the drift of population towards the cities is seen in all the nations which are advanced in the elements of civilization, the forces which produce it must of necessity be equally extended in the field of their operation. These are, chiefly, the increase in education, which gives rise to new aspirations and predilections ; and the instinct of association which has always been potent in the human breast, but which in this age, far more than was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the case at any period in the past, has both the opportunity and the incentive to assert itself. The first of these forces renders men dissatisfied with the old conditions, and furnishes the spur which impels them to seek or create means to improve their circumstances. The second force draws men together for mutual assistance and puts them in harmonious coöperation. Division of employment takes place and individual tastes and aptitudes are developed. As a result, labor-economizing appliances are continually being devised, and the task of each person is gradually lightened, while the aggregate product or wealth of all and the proportionate share of each are steadily and rapidly increased. Ethnological and political influences also operate in this direction, though, perhaps, with less potency and persistency than the social and economic forces. Racial vigor tells in the struggle for national development, and that country grows most rapidly and symmetrically in which Government interferes least with the legitimate activities of the people. These conditions are more fully and fairly met in the United States and Great Britain than in any other nations, and in these countries the growth in population and wealth is greatest.

The resultant of the operation of these forces finds its natural and inevitable expression in the creation of cities. Thus in cities, while labor for each individual is simplified and lightened, its rewards are largely increased and the conveniences and comforts of life are multiplied.

How long will this drain of population from the thinly to the thickly settled communities continue? Perhaps reason may suggest an answer to this query. The basis of all wealth is agriculture, and the highest material and moral advancement of a people is dependent on the harmonious development of their agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial interests. The free interchange of commodities between the nations, which is likely to come in the not remote future, may lessen the rigidity of this requirement, so far as concerns the leading nations, but it cannot safely be disregarded altogether. A time must come under existing tendencies when farm articles will command, with respect to other commodities, a price sufficiently high to render their production more profitable than at present. Then the drift from farm to factory and mercantile house will slowly subside, and a general readjustment of employments and interests will gradually be brought about.

CHARLES M. HARVEY.

THE NEW YORK TRADE SCHOOLS.*

THE charge has often been made that the higher education given in the public schools unfits young men for manual labor, that the public school graduate, to use a common expression, is "lost to the trades." The advocates of a high standard of public education have not been able to contradict this charge. They have seen that the youths who entered the trades usually left school at fourteen or fifteen years of age, and they have also seen that the young men who have had the benefit of a liberal education looked for clerkships or employment in what are known as genteel callings, where perhaps the pay was low and the chances of promotion small,

* Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan has recently given $500,000 to the endowment of these schools.—ED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instead of endeavoring to unite skill of hand with a well trained mind, and so avail themselves of the present high wages and the future openings which skilled labor in this country commands. Manual training was grasped at as a solution of the difficulty, and although it has proved of great value in developing observation as well as dexterity, and thereby aiding in ordinary educational work, yet those who entered the ranks of skilled labor continued to leave school at just the age they should be there, and those who graduated did not become mechanics.

If a system of education carried on at the public expense swelled the ranks of the non-producers, and rendered young men unfit to earn a living by the labor of their hands, the result would be a sufficient reason for its condemnation. The reason, however, why a good education and manual labor are regarded as incompatible, is not because the well-educated youth is unwilling to become a mechanic, but because he is not wanted in the workshop, and until recently there has been no way of learning a trade except in a workshop. To learn a trade in a workshop requires a considerable length of time, from four to five years being the customary term. For the first two years of his apprenticeship the youth is expected to make himself useful by doing an errand boy's work and by attending to such odd jobs as may be required of him by his employer, by the foreman, or the journeymen. Then, when he begins to learn his trade, the temptation is strong to keep him at what he can do best, lest he may spoil material and waste the time for which he is paid. Systematic instruction is rarely attempted, and in many workshops, owing to the subdivision of labor, is impossible. It is not surprising that four or five years are considered necessary to learn a trade in this way; it is, on the contrary, remarkable that it can be learned at all. A youth who remained at school until he was eighteen would be too old for the lad's work required of the beginner, and he would be twenty-two years of age before he could earn a man's wages. Shortening the school term is therefore a necessity under this system of trade instruction.

The question might reasonably be asked, Why should so long a time be spent in acquiring a trade; why, if so much time is wasted in work not connected with learning a trade, could not the apprenticeship be made two instead of four or more years? This reduction would enable a youth to get a good education, and yet give him the opportunity during his minority to become a skilled workman. Here the power of organized labor has to be met. The trade-unions say that an apprenticeship must be at least four years long. How that time is passed is a matter of indifference. The policy of the trade-unions, or rather of the foreign-born labor leaders who control them, is not to make good workmen, but to keep our young countrymen out of the trades. To carry out this policy, not only is a narrow limit put upon the number of young men who shall be allowed to learn a trade, but their apprenticeship is made as unprofitable and, consequently, as discouraging as possible.

During the last few years attempts have been made by the unions, and in some cases with the approval of the associations of master-mechanics, to require those young men who are permitted to learn a trade to be indentured, that is, to be bound to serve and obey their masters for a term of years. Such was the custom until the commencement of this century. But the old-time apprentice was practically an adopted son, living with his master, working under his supervision, and associating on equal terms with his children. This patriarchal system is not now possible, as the master no longer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

works with his men, and can give very little care to his apprentice; neither does he want the lad in his home. Respectable parents are seldom willing to surrender the control of their sons, and no spirited lad can rest contented in a position which differs only in name from slavery. He either seeks to have the indenture set aside, or, if he remains, he is likely to attempt to "get even" with his master by loafing or indifference. No surer way can be found of making manual labor appear contemptible than by depriving the youthful mechanic of his liberty.

Eleven years ago the New York Trade Schools were established, to enable young men to learn certain trades, and to give young men already in these trades an opportunity to improve themselves. Trade instruction was then almost unknown in this country, and it was some years later that the report of the Royal Commission on Technical Education gave the first clear idea of what was being done in Europe. This effort to introduce in this country a new system of trade instruction encountered the hostility of the trade-unions. It, however, received the hearty support of many master-mechanics, while the approbation of the newspapers caused the trade schools to become widely known. The attendance, beginning at thirty, soon ran into the hundreds, until now each winter between five and six hundred young men fill the workrooms. At first the attendance was drawn from the workshops where the young men felt they were learning but little, and from that large class of young men who are earning a living at what are known as boy occupations, which have no future for the man. For their accommodation evening instruction was given. Then another class of young men saw the advantages that might be derived from trade-school instruction; young men who had remained at public or private schools until eighteen or over, and who were supposed to have been educated above working with their hands. These young men, who were too old, or unfitted by their bringing up, for a long apprenticeship with its drudgery and waste of time, were quick to see that not only as skilled workmen could they earn higher pay than can easily be obtained in other callings, but that there were openings for them as master-mechanics more promising than could be found in stores and offices. They wanted more thorough instruction than could be given to the evening classes, and they were able and willing to pay for it. For them day instruction was provided, and in many cases, in their eagerness to learn, the same young men joined both the day and evening classes. This desire to acquire a trade on the part of well-educated young men is not merely a local one. Young men come to the New York Trade Schools each year from all parts of the Union and from Canada. Young men from Maine and California, from Nova Scotia and Florida, meet in the trade-school workshops.

The multiplication of trade schools will give our young countrymen the opportunity to become skilled workmen now denied them in many trades by the unions, and the thoroughness of trade-school instruction will make American mechanics the best in the world. Bringing well-educated young men into the trades, as trade schools will do, means the elevation of labor. It means that a portion at least of the gulf that separates those who work with their brains from those who work with their hands will be bridged over. A calling is judged by the education of those who follow it. The clerk earning perhaps five dollars a week is shown into the rich man's drawing room, while the mechanic who receives four dollars per day is left standing in the hall. Coarse hands and soiled clothing are not inseparable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from a mechanic's work; the athlete often does rougher, the sportsman and surgeon less tidy work.

A man whose name is honored throughout this country, an overseer of Harvard College, looking at a photographic group of graduates of the New York Trade Schools, remarked that it would be difficult to distinguish the young mechanics from a group of Harvard students. The fact that such young men wish to be mechanics, and that this desire exists all over the United States, would seem to prove that young Americans are not disqualified by education from working with their hands.

RICHARD T. AUCHMUTY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED